THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

F. R. Scott

I. The Background

In the body politic disease grows slowly, though the symptoms may disclose themselves in sudden fashion. Canada is now stricken with a form of constitutional paralysis, the beginnings of which can be traced to a distant past. It was as long ago as 1883 that a certain Lord Watson began to sit on the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and to mould Canadian constitutional law to his conception of the loosely knit federal state. In a series of opinions between 1883 and 1899 he evolved new concepts of constitutional law of a particularly decentralizing character, and he elevated the provincial legislatures to the position of sovereign parliaments in full possession of the Crown and its prerogatives. In the words of an admirer* who later followed in his footsteps, he

> made the business of laying down the new law that was necessary his own. *He completely altered the tendency of the decisions of the Supreme Court*, and established in the first place the sovereignty (subject to the power to interfere of the Imperial Parliament alone) of the legislatures of Ontario, Quebec and the other Provinces. He then worked out as a principle the direct relation, in point of exercise of the prerogative, of the Lieutenant-Governors to the Crown. *In a series of masterly judgments he expounded and established the real constitution of Canada.* The liquor laws, the Indian reserve lands, the title to regalia, including the precious metals, were brought before a Judicial Committee, in which he took the

*J. B. Haldane, "Lord Watson," in *Juridical Review*, 1899, pp. 279-80; italics mine. I am indebted for this reference to Mr. C. M. Woodworth, K.C., of Vancouver. The complete article is the best extant recognition of the political function of the Judicial Committee. The statement was repeated in a later article by Lord Haldane in the *Cambridge Law Journal* of 1922, cited in 1930 in the *Canadian Bar Review*, p. 438.

leading part, for consideration as to which of the rival claims to legislate ought to prevail. Nowhere is his memory likely to be more gratefully preserved than in those distant Canadian provinces whose rights of self-government he placed on a basis that was both intelligible and firm.

The "distant provinces" were grateful at first; perhaps of late they have begun to realize the costs of sovereignty. Lord Watson's overriding of the Canadian Supreme Court was the turning point in the evolution of the Dominion constitution. No serious lack of balance would have resulted from these decisions alone. The process, however, was carried much further: Canada was blessed with not one but two "provincial rights" champions. The substitution of the Privy Council's for the Canadian view of the B. N. A. Act continued apace under Lord Haldane, author of the above passage, who dominated the Judicial Committee from 1911 to 1928. His influence was particularly strong during the experimental years of post-War reconstruction, when Canada was feeling her way toward new social controls. Under him the Dominion again suffered a series of constitutional defeats, enough to discourage the most ardent reformer in national politics and to excuse in some degree the paltry nature of the advances which Canada has made in social reform since the Great War. Perhaps his chief contribution was the virtual elimination of the Dominion residuary clause, by the application of the doctrine, nowhere mentioned in the B. N. A. Act, that the residuary powers cannot be employed so as to encroach upon property and civil rights except in times of extreme national crisis. The Fathers of Confederation had used the simpler tests of "general advantage" and "common interest to the whole country" as criteria of Dominion competency.

For a brief moment from 1930 to 1932 it seemed that

the pendulum had begun to swing the other way. Radio and aeronautics were added to the federal jurisdiction, and the Dominion was held to be man enough to place a woman in the Senate. The gallant excursion was soon over, however. With the decisions—the six decisions—necessitated by Mr. Bennett's bold advance towards a controlled economy not only was the promise of the recent cases broken, but the sovereignty of the Provinces was carried even into the international sphere. The power to implement treaties affecting Canada has now been divided, and many of the most important subjects of international agreement must henceforth fall within provincial competence. This has occurred despite the section in the B. N. A. Act giving treaty powers to the Dominion, and despite the geographical limitation of the provincial jurisdiction over property and civil rights by the words "in the province."

The extent of the constitutional change wrought by judicial interpretation may perhaps be illustrated graphically by contrasting the following lists of subjects. The left-hand table shows the Dominion powers, that on the right the provincial powers, both under the original Act and as a result of the most important court decisions since 1867:

ORIGINAL ACT

Dominion	*Provinces*
Residuary power over all subjects not coming within provincial field.	Specified powers overfifteen classes of subjects (Property and Civil Rights "in the province," Municipal Institutions, *etc.*).
Specified powers over twenty-nine classes of subjects (Trade and Commerce, Banking, Criminal Law, *etc.*).	Residuary power over matters "of a merely local or private nature in the province."
Treaty legislation for all treaties then able to affect Canada.	

JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION

Dominion Additions

1. Liquor control (in small part).
2. Sunday observance.
3. Interprovincial telephones.
4. Labour contracts on Dominion undertakings.
5. Radio broadcasting.
6. Aeronautics.
7. Criminal trade practices.
8. Dominion companies cannot have their capacity destroyed by provincial laws.
9. Customs dues leviable on the importation of provincial crown property.
10. Farmers-Creditors Arrangements.
11. Trade and Industry Commission.

Provincial Additions

1. Treaty legislation upon any subject belonging to the Provinces.
2. Regulation of intra-provincial trade.
3. Regulation of intra-provincial marketing.
4. Regulation of intra-provincial production.
5. Regulation of intra-provincial prices.
6. Wages control.
7. Hours of labour by day or by week.
8. Weekly day of rest.
9. Unemployment insurance.
10. Workmen's compensation.
11. Health regulations.
12. Trades Union laws.
13. Industrial disputes.
14. Liquor control (in large part).
15. Insurance laws.
16. Control of security sales: "blue sky" laws.
17. Right to create companies with power to act outside the Province.
18. Taxing power extended to taxes on consumption and sales.
19. Escheats.
20. Ownership of Indian lands and beds of navigable rivers.
21. "Property and Civil Rights" overrides Dominion residuary clause except in extreme emergency.

In addition to these subjects, all of which have come before the courts, it is clear that the burden of unemployment relief, factory inspection, health insurance, slum clearance, mothers' allowances, and a host of lesser social services, also falls on the Provinces.

The above portrayal has the defects of all over-simplifications, but it is submitted as showing fairly enough the result of judicial interpretation. There is little wonder that the country now faces the grave problem of constitutional change. The financial arrangements of 1867 between the Dominion and the Provinces were based on the idea that the heavy burdens would all fall upon the Dominion, which was consequently given unlimited taxing power, while the Provinces would be capable of living on a modest income suitable to their modest functions. That this intention has been generally frustrated will be shown by a glance at the analysis of judicial decisions. Legislative decentralization has necessitated financial adjustment. The period since 1867 has in consequence been marked by a series of revisions to the subsidies clause of the original B. N. A. Act, and latterly by a series of Royal Commissions, each of which has investigated some particular sectional claim for added financial support. Thus the Maritimes in 1926 and again in 1934, British Columbia in 1927, Manitoba in 1929, Saskatchewan and Alberta in 1934, all had their claims and grievances aired before a Royal Commission, and many of their demands met. The present Royal Commission is unique in that it is the first which has been instructed to view the constitutional problem from the point of view of Canada as a whole. It has, indeed, a greater task and a greater opportunity than has faced any constitutional body that has sat in Canada since the Quebec Conference of 1864.

II. The Nature of the Problem

The legal element in the problems with which the Rowell Commission must deal is selected for emphasis because it has not received as much attention as have

some other aspects of its work. The popular emphasis tends to be laid on the financial burdens, the growth of debt, the cost of government, the overlapping of taxing authorities, as though these were somehow the real root of the trouble. That they are serious matters, none would deny. But they are in great part the product of the fundamental constitutional maladjustment. Taxing authorities overlap because functions overlap. Costs of government are high because the courts have decreed that Canada is nine separate countries as regards a number of social and economic controls, so that nine, often ten, administrative staffs must be carried. Provinces are short of funds, not because the constitution restricts their taxing power (actually, as pointed out above, the Provinces have now a far wider taxing power than they had at Confederation), but because heavy national burdens like unemployment relief have been placed on local governments. The inefficiency that is complained of bears witness to the lack of a governmental organization that is in harmony with modern needs and modern capacities for administration over a wide area.

The task of the Royal Commission will thus be twofold, once it has accumulated the necessary statistical data on which to make practical decisions. Its first duty will be to propose improvements in those fields which do not require constitutional adjustment. Several of these can be suggested. Reforms in the machinery of taxation, for example, can be made without meeting legal difficulties. Income should be taxed at the source as in England. A single collection agency for income tax requires nothing more than Dominion-provincial agreement as to method and apportionment. The agreement could extend to municipalities. There is much to commend the idea from the point of view of mere con-

venience, though it is difficult to imagine that any considerable savings could be effected. It is also clear that no such arrangement would prevent future changes by individual governments in their rates of taxation whenever they chose to make them.

Another field where improvements can be easily effected is municipal finance. Municipalities have hitherto been a much neglected part of our governmental structure, but now that they have got themselves heavily into debt their constitutional status has greatly increased. So much is this the case that the present Commission has been instructed to look into their problems, despite the fact that municipal institutions as such are a strictly provincial matter. When it is realized, however, that the city of Montreal has a budget far larger than that of the Province of Quebec, there will be seen to be good reason for extending the survey into municipal government. Without it no complete picture of the public debt situation can be drawn. The abandonment of real estate as the principal basis of municipal finance, the assumption by the Provinces of a greater share of municipal services, are solutions capable of achievement within the existing constitutional framework. However, the making of unemployment relief a fully federal responsibility—a reform sorely overdue for municipal as well as other reasons—may well be dubious without constitutional amendment, in view of some remarks made in the Privy Council decision on the Employment and Social Security Act. Where such doubts exist, clarification requires a change in the B. N. A. Act.

Still other important reforms may be recommended in relation to the incidence of taxation. The Commission has been instructed "to determine whether taxation as at present allocated and imposed is as equitable and as

efficient as can be devised." The question of equity should receive proper attention. Much is heard of inefficiency in taxation, but far too little of the relation between taxation and ability to pay. By comparison with some other democracies, Canada taxes her rich too little and her poor too much. We have only begun to exploit the possibilities of succession duties; at present our yield from this source, allowing for differences of population, is below that of Australia and New Zealand, and far below that of England. The income tax, besides its hitherto inefficient collection, has been comparatively lenient in its middle and upper brackets. Canada depends far more than does Great Britain upon regressive taxation that bears on the poor as much as (and therefore more severely than) on the rich; more than eighty per cent. of our combined Dominion and provincial taxation comes from such sources, whereas in Great Britain approximately fifty per cent. comes from income and inheritance taxes. Changes in the incidence of taxation depend not on constitutional law, but upon the simple question of the degree of governmental concern with the distribution of wealth. Hitherto that concern has not been much in evidence. Few people would deny that the contrasts in standards of living in Canada to-day and the concentration of wealth are greater than have ever before existed. We have been allowing our social structure to become progressively less democratic and equalitarian in this respect.

This first group of problems will be easier for the Commission to deal with than will the second group which involve constitutional alteration. The terms of reference of the Commission include consideration of the ability of the Dominion and provincial governments to discharge their governmental responsibilities "within the

framework of the present allocation of public functions and powers, *or on the basis of some form of re-allocation thereof*." The choice of constitutional amendment as a solution to financial problems is thus open. It is to be hoped that the difficulties in the way of this solution will not prevent a thorough exploration of its advantages and disadvantages in every appropriate field. In practice, since judicial amendments have so favoured the Provinces, proposed amendments are likely to be in favour of greater Dominion powers. The fundamental problem will be to select the criteria by which the advantages of federal control can be measured. At this point in its inquiry the Commission will meet questions that go far deeper than financial need or legal analysis. The very purposes of government and of union will be in issue. What kind of a country do Canadians want? Do they aim to be a strong and united people from coast to coast, working closely together to promote the social and economic well-being of all, sharing equally in the burdens and benefits of national life, and preserving peace and free government in the land? If that is so, then it is abundantly clear that the present preponderance of powers in the hands of nine sovereign governments will never achieve this end. Or do they prefer to accept the factors of geography, race, and religion as insurmountable barriers and to allow the maximum diversity to the several sections? In that case the confederacy which we so closely resemble should be openly acknowledged, and the Dominion should continue to be little more than an agency for collecting taxes for the Provinces, maintaining defence forces, and regulating foreign trade through the tariff. The Royal Commission cannot avoid making up its own mind as to which of these alternatives is to be favoured, and in what degree. A decision to leave legislative powers as they are and merely

to improve the technique of tax-collecting would be a decision in favour of further national disintegration.

III. Social Reform and the Royal Commission

Canada has come through eight years of economic and social testing of a very severe character. She has emerged with much more knowledge of the workings of her economy, but with only slight changes in the men, the methods, and the mental attitudes which composed the system that collapsed in 1929. Reform has been avoided to a degree remarkable in relation to the disclosed need, remarkable also by comparison with other democracies. The Privy Council having frustrated the only national effort that was made to correct the abuses of capitalism, Canada is left with the creation of a central bank and some patchy provincial social legislation as the major achievements of this critical decade. Meanwhile the national budget remains unbalanced, the national debt steadily grows, the concentration of wealth increases, monopolistic economic power is no further curbed, the unemployed remain unemployed, the numbers on relief are augmented by drought as much as they are thinned by recovery, the precarious security of industrial wages and agricultural prices is liable to be suddenly destroyed by the advent of a new depression against which we have taken no precautions, while in certain parts of the country the principle of democracy itself is openly challenged and violation of civil liberties condoned by high authorities in church and state. Economic recovery has not cured these evils; it has merely rendered them less urgent.

In this wider setting the possible help from the Rowell Commission, essential and important as it is, is bound to be far short of what is required to deal with existing problems. If Canadians are led to believe that

the creation of such a Commission has somehow eased the situation, if its existence lulls them into a feeling that there is plenty of time in which to act, then they may be due for a rude awakening. No report can be expected from the present Commission before the autumn of 1938; when it arrives it must be studied before action can be proposed; when action is proposed the problem of the method of amendment to the B. N. A. Act still remains. On that there is no agreement, and discussion of it is outside the Commission's terms of reference. If the uncontrolled factors which at present determine the swing of the trade cycle, the coming of booms and depressions, chance to work in Canada's favour, there may be time enough in which to act. But should a new economic crisis occur, then some rapid decisions will have to be made by Canada on some very profound questions—one of them perhaps being the elementary question as to whether we shall continue to exist as a single country. In either case it is the opinion of the present writer that the area within which a progressive democracy must get to work in this Dominion is far wider than that mapped out for consideration by the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations.

THE PLIGHT OF CANADIAN FICTION

MORLEY CALLAGHAN

SPEAKING at the Toronto Book Fair, I pointed out that a young Canadian writer who had an authentic talent for creative prose, and wanted to develop it honestly, had little or no chance in this country; immediately people protested that Ralph Connor had made a million dollars, and that anyway it was sour grapes for a writer to make faces at people for not reading his work.

All I can say is that I felt perfectly free to make this criticism because ever since I started to write I had earned my living in the United States and expected to go on doing so. At the time I was thinking of those young prose writers in this country who were trying desperately to get started, and who, being Canadians, seemed to think they ought to get published in their own country. I was simply trying to tell them that if they were very good and had a distinctive talent and wrote honestly the chances were that they would not get published at all in this country unless they were first of all published some place else.

It has been said that it takes an honest fiction writer who loves his work about ten years to force himself upon the public. Some very great writers meet with no acclaim until years after their death: but sooner or later they get it. Yet even with this nice consoling thought in the back of his head a young writer knows that he has to find somebody to publish him; he won't grow and ripen, book after book, in the darkness of his own attic. He has to have some kind of an audience.

There are two ways for a man to get his fiction published: he may sit down and study the fiction market offered by the big magazines, and if he is intelligent and

not impatient and has the gift at all he may succeed in giving the editors the thing they want. He meets the market. Success may come to such a writer very quickly. In no time at all he may have an enormous income, because there are vast profits to be made from writing for the big slick magazines.

What such a writer has to do is be very careful to see that he is always saying the thing that people want to have said: he must never demand that a reader turn his head sharply to the left or the right: he must forever curb his instinct to say to the reader, "Look at it my way. You never looked at it before like this. But look at it." If he should make this mistake, and the editor should let it get by him, the consequences are apt to be pretty terrible for everybody concerned. The reader may have been made to feel uncomfortable. Worse still, he may actually have been made unhappy. He may write to the editor, or simply stop reading that particular writer and advise his friends to do so. The circulation of the magazine will drop if the same thing happens two or three times. If this dubious and revolutionary activity continues, the editor himself becomes the unhappiest man of all; he is out of the job. And properly so. He has failed as a comforter.

I heard of an editor of a large Canadian national weekly who had figured this all out and was determined that he wouldn't lose his job. He had it figured out that his circulation was so large that anybody who wrote in his sheet was really writing for everybody. The problem, therefore, became a question of what everybody really liked; or the quality a piece should have that would recommend it to absolutely everybody. In no time he solved the problem by the following process of elimination. It seemed obvious that a piece should have no personal

quality whatever in the writing: personal qualities separate the writer from the masses. Everybody knows that. Then too, the piece shouldn't be written too sharply: that would require the reader to stir himself and sometimes focus his attention abruptly. This would be equivalent to making the reader feel uncomfortable, a thing to be dreaded like the infantile paralysis. And it was just as obvious that the piece should never stir up a train of thought: if it did, one group of readers might be separated from another and the whole national circulation idea might be destroyed. Most important of all the reader should never be deeply moved: he might start brooding. And no magazine ever had a big circulation of brooders. So the editor went up and down the scale in this fashion, and he worked out his formula: "Everything must be watered down, everything must be thinned out till the piece has practically no substance, then no one can be offended." The editor felt quite happy about it. When even his best and most highly paid writers laid their work before him he smiled charmingly and said, "This is fine but we'll have to thin it out a little more."

This editor, who explained all this to me himself, was an intelligent man who thought he was doing what any other shrewd and intelligent man would do who wanted to hold his job.

But the young Canadian writer, trying to meet the market and make some money, has as good a chance in this field as anybody else. The market in Canada for this kind of work is a modest one, but the pay might be a lot worse, and if the writer gets slick enough he can drift easily into the big American markets and get rich. He shouldn't deceive himself that it is as easy as it sounds. It is a field of entertainment like vaudeville and is frightfully competitive. Great ingenuity is required.

My point is that there are rewards in Canada, and even a future, for a writer who does this kind of fiction.

But what about the writer who wants to have his own growth and look at reality with his own eyes and record adult experience in a fresh form he moulds for himself?

Not that it is enough, Lord knows, just to be honest: you can be honest and terribly dull and have no creative imagination: but in the trade, I understand, the agents and editors make this general distinction between honest writers and writers who are just entertainers.

The greatest joy that comes to a writer comes when he goes on year after year doing the thing he loves in his own way, never yielding, and maybe taking a bad beating now and then, and suddenly finds that he has won for himself an audience and that people have learned to look at it in his way. With this triumph may come his death as an artist. The general acceptance and adulation may well ruin him. He may devote the rest of his life to trying to keep his audience without ever offending them. He may become a comforter just like the slick creator of drugstore literature we were talking about a minute ago. But he had that one hour of triumph.

However, the Canadian writer need never fear that such a triumph in Canada may mean the death of his spirit. Such a triumph is impossible here. The kind of writer I am talking about now can have no beginning in this country, no growth here, no "being" as a Canadian writer. Why? Because he has no place here to publish his wares.

But what about our great national magazines, what about the book fair, what about the customs duties that protect Canadian publishers and writers from the influx of literature from the United States?

Our national magazines are comparable to the national magazines in the United States, magazines like *Colliers*, *The Woman's Home Companion*, *etc.*—what are called the big "slicks." They want a certain kind of fiction running to a formula and comforting to millions of people. From time to time they will publish what they call a "quality" story, but hardly ever by a newcomer.

In the United States the hope of the beginning writer who has some ambition and love of his work is the "quality" group of magazines—*Harper's*, *Scribner's*, the *Atlantic*, *Esquire*, *The New Yorker*. He hopes that he will write in these magazines till he becomes very famous, and then the national circulation magazines will want to print him.

But in Canada there are simply no magazines of this kind. The country doesn't seem to be able to afford them. There are a few papers like *The Canadian Forum*, but they cannot afford to pay for contributions. Obviously then, the Canadian story-tellers, the Canadian Chekhovs, Maupassants, Andersons, Katherine Mansfields, if there are ever to be any, are not going to bob up in these parts: they are going to put their heads above water in the United States, and then maybe later on be read at home.

If the new Canadian writer has written a novel he has a little better chance than the short-story writer. There are Canadian publishers, though they operate under very special conditions as far as Canadian fiction is concerned, and certainly in a country that is no publisher's paradise. In the whole of Canada there are about eleven million people. The French language is spoken by some four million of the population, which leaves the Canadian publisher seven million customers to work on, seven million distributed across the continent, and this doesn't

offer the publisher a field for his activities as large as the population of the city of New York.

I say that the Canadian publisher operates under special conditions because he can remain in business as a distributor of fiction and never publish a work of fiction by a Canadian writer. Why should he take such a chance on work he knows will be unprofitable, he may ask. Hasn't the most ambitious of the Canadian publishers pointed out that his profits on Canadian literature amount to one per cent.? So the publisher imports the fiction lists of the English and American publishers—and everybody is quite satisfied.

This is a special condition, I say, because Canada, culturally, is sandwiched in between two countries that speak the same language, which makes it a good deal different than if the people of France, say, were asked to read only the fiction of Germany and England.

Some seventy-five years ago all Americans were expected to look to London as a cultural and publishing centre. But in those days Americans, looking around them, began to see that they were living in a new world and they began to record it. And the people inhabiting the continent began to take pride in their world and their own ways, and they began to like to see it recorded. When the population grew and far surpassed that of England the business of American writing and publishing solved itself. Maybe it was solved too for Canadian writers then and we simply can't bear to recognize it. But this is another distasteful and melancholy thought to be having at this moment when the bugles are blowing so loudly for Canadian literature. All I'm saying is that a Canadian publisher can handle fiction year after year without ever actually publishing a Canadian novel and

no one is made unhappy, because everybody is getting the books he wants to read anyway.

Of course a publisher, reading this, is likely to jump up and point with pride to the fiction he has published by Canadians. Of course, fiction by Canadians has been published in this country, but the chances are that it was published in some other country first. And saying this should not be construed as an attack on Canadian publishers. Any publisher in any country, if he is worth his salt and likes his trade, is eager to publish a book of his own choosing. Such eagerness, however, on the part of Canadian publishers, when they are dealing with Canadian fiction, has to be exhausted in the main, in a long-drawn-out sigh and a wistful smile.

Supposing a Canadian writes a novel, and being a local boy, his eyes aglow from attending banquets and listening to speeches about Canadian literature and how it should be fostered, he rushes to a local publisher with his manuscript. Time passes and the book is read. The novelist's hopes are raised high, for the publisher tells him that he must have him on his list; from that day on he may count on him as his Canadian publisher. But there may be a delay of a few months the publisher explains. The publisher is going to try and sell the book in England or the United States, and if he succeeds, have the book printed abroad; and maybe then he will buy a thousand copies of the book and market them in Canada.

So, one may ask, does this mean a Canadian who writes a novel has to get it published abroad or have a local publisher arrange to get it printed abroad? Generally speaking, yes, although remember that a publisher may always have a book under the table written by a Canadian and published here and nowhere else on earth, to thrust triumphantly into my face. I'm talking about

the way it usually goes. And before the reader gets filled with such a disillusioned rage that he wants to rush around to all the local publishing houses and thump on their doors and break their windows, let him remember this: the publishers are in the publishing business for the same reason you, gentle reader, are in the plumbing or basket-weaving business: they think they can make more money doing the thing they are doing than any other way. They are not patriotic societies endowed by the government. And in their further defence it must be stated that it is practically impossible for them to sell a thousand copies of a novel by a Canadian in Canada even if they gamble and buy that many copies, so it is not even to be asked why they don't at least publish the thousand copies in this country. They can't do it without losing money. At least two thousand copies of a novel must be sold before the publisher breaks even on it, which is a pretty good explanation of why Canadian novels are not published by Canadian publishers. I can't think of a more completely satisfactory explanation.

But these dreadfully melancholy musings lead inevitably to one terrifying thought. If an honest sincere Canadian writer can't live off the avails of his creative work in this country, if there is no place for him to print his work here, and if he finds that, even when he writes books that sell, the mother publishing house is apt to be in the United States, is, then, the Canadian literature we hear so much about at various times of the year really necessary?

This is a bad question to ask. It leads you to wondering just what Canadian literature really is. And then you take a look at the map and you wonder if a recording of the life of Vancouver on the Pacific in creative prose is closer culturally or regionally to a recording of the life and

landscape of a lake city away on the other side of the continent like Toronto, than it is, say, to a novel about Seattle. Or then again, some impious fellow, with an evil sneer on his face, may duck his head in and ask why a Toronto school of literature should be more important than a Buffalo or Detroit school of literature. While it is readily conceded that groups in both cities are of equal importance and that it is possible for a regional literature to come from the districts they represent, it should be plain to any writer that he will have to make his way in the big outside world no matter what kind of a local reputation he has.

Maybe I'm wrong about this: I haven't spent much time on it and don't intend to. But with all the lip-service being rendered these days on the hustings to Canadian literature, with all the energy being let loose in the way of banquets, speeches, the hearty advice and *obiter dicta* of big brothers, men who offer themselves as spirit guides and the wistful souls who long to be presidents of some literary society or other, it is very important that the provincialism of these people shouldn't be allowed to take on the air of patriotic dignity or great cultural nobility. Let these affairs provide a round of social activities for those restless people who need them, but for heaven's sake let not the few writers in the country be touched by them. I admit that it's probably very terrifying to the three or four fiction writers in the country when the hundred and fifty cheer-leaders rush at them, glassy-eyed, to organize them and comfort them and put them on the right track. Yet it should be possible to take it all in the spirit of good clean fun. No writer worth his salt should be harmed. Maybe it will even be possible for him to get a word in and explain that there is no spiritual gratification to be found simply in the

sale of any book, no matter what kind of tripe, in Canada, any more than there is in the sale of a package of tea; and that anyway the trouble with Canada is not that Canadians don't buy books as well as the people of other countries—in terms of comparative populations Canadians do buy books: the trouble is that there is not much sense of adventure in reading in our people: they go for the books that have a big sale in other countries. Maybe this is inevitable. Maybe Canadians never will have a separate taste or awareness distinct from the provincial cities of North America. Maybe it isn't even desirable that they should have, especially when their writers have to sink or swim and be broken or made outside the country.

In the meantime then, to repeat, writers of fiction need not expect to be nursed along in their own country. But should they be unhappy about this? I don't think so. Fewer Canadian writers will get published, but the ones who do will have to be good enough to compete with their brethren from across the line. The going may be pretty rough for young writers till they are ready to spread their wings, but if they have the itch they will go on. Of course it may be a little maddening to them at times if they are present when the local medicine men are feasting and having a big cultural pow-wow; but if they get into the banquet on a rain check they can always bring everybody down to earth by getting up and asking humbly how many writers of adult fiction have appeared in the country in the last ten years.

TUDOR HUMANISM AND HENRY VIII

DOUGLAS BUSH

IN his admirable *Thomas More*, Professor R. W. Chambers pillories Henry VIII as the ruthless destroyer of the rich culture which England possessed at the opening of the sixteenth century. He makes his own the argument put forth by J. S. Phillimore[1] in what he calls "a vital essay, to which every student of More is under a heavy debt." Phillimore's thesis was "that the Humanist Movement in England was arrested at the middle of the sixteenth century and did not mature till more than a century later; that the movement was typically personified in More; and that his death was the blow which paralysed it." Mr. Chambers elaborates "the story of arrest and frustration" in this manner:

> The poets flocked to Henry's court; he stopped their music, and for a generation after the execution of Surrey there is nothing worth notice, save the sombre poems in which Sackville, before turning away from poetry, lamented that eminence led only to destruction. In the ordinary course, Surrey might have lived another thirty or forty years, the centre of a circle of court poets. As it is, the history of the sonnet in England is a blank between 1547 and about 1580, and English poetry as a whole is negligible till it begins its magnificent progress again with Spenser and Sidney. Prose had a similar set-back. After the generation of Tyndale and Coverdale, Fisher and More and his school, there is no eminence till we come to Hooker and Bacon—a gap of more than a generation. Contemporaries noticed the gap, and wondered that More's example had not proved more fruitful. In the field of scholarship Henry's achievement was really remarkable. There were four great international scholars, and, in England, two great patrons of learning. Of the six, Henry cold-shouldered Erasmus out of England, imprisoned Vives, decapitated More and Fisher, and frightened Wolsey to death. "Had Erasmus, instead of being an honoured

[1] *Dublin Review*, 1913.

guest at Rome, at Paris, or in the States of the Empire, been beheaded by Charles V or Francis I, all learning would have felt the blow, and shrunk."[2] In England, all learning felt the blow, and shrank. It was not till the days of Bentley that classical scholarship recovered in England the position it held in the days of Erasmus, before Henry axed it. To the Universities, Henry's spoliation meant a loss, for which the foundation of a few Readerships offered small compensation. In 1550 Latimer writes, "It would pity a man's heart to hear that, that I hear of the state of Cambridge. . . . I think there be at this day ten thousand students less than were within these twenty years, and fewer preachers." As to the grammar schools, More's school of St. Antony was only one of a vast number which withered away.[3]

In a brief survey of a complex problem I must pass by many topics that Mr. Chambers touches. The lack of good poets in the middle of the century, for instance, might be charged against God rather than against his royal representative, for there are many ages of peace and plenty in which good poets simply do not happen to be born. As for a blank in the history of the sonnet between 1547 and 1580, if Henry was responsible for that it ought to be listed along with the royal navy as one of his major achievements; one can only wish the blank had lasted twenty years longer. And, in spite of Mr. Chambers's notable study of early English prose, one is bewildered by the critical judgment which finds no eminence in prose between More's time and Hooker and Bacon. Is there no eminence in the *Book of Common Prayer*, in North's *Plutarch*, in Sidney's *Defence of Poesy*, in Hakluyt's *Voyages*, not to mention such lesser but able prosemen as Ascham, Hoby, Richard Eden, and others?

But our concern here is with humanism in its special

[2] *Op. cit.*

[3] *Thomas More*, London, 1935, p. 379. In his new book, *The Place of Saint Thomas More in English Literature and History* (Longmans, 1937), Professor Chambers returns to the charge (*e.g.*, pp. 79, 92 *ff.*), but I find no occasion to modify anything I have said.

sense, and with the theory that it was paralysed by the execution of More. The proponents of this view give small evidence that the execution of the lord chancellor of England was felt as a blow to learning; they only feel that that must have been the effect. But, granted for the moment that the arrest of humanism was as complete as these scholars allege, there were far too many factors involved to permit any such simple explanation. I cannot find reason to suppose that the course of Tudor humanism would have been very different from what it was if More and Fisher had never been executed. To say that is not, of course, to slight the great service that both men, especially Fisher, did to learning.

For the main cause of the setback to learning in the universities, one has only to recall the conditions in which scholars were living. In the twenty-five years from 1535 to 1560, the official religion of the country changed four times, from papal to non-papal Catholicism, from that to Protestantism, from Protestantism to papal Catholicism, and from that to Protestantism again. The university men who lived through this period were, of course, at the centre of religious and political controversy and were subjected, directly or indirectly, to successive and conflicting religious tests. And no sooner had the Elizabethan settlement been reached than strife between Anglican and Puritan commenced. From looking abroad at the present time we know how difficult it is for disinterested learning to flourish when scholars have lost their consciousness of freedom and security. In the middle of the sixteenth century there were keener anxieties than that—the fear of eating mice at Zürich, or, much worse, of imprisonment and death. Ascham, thanks largely to the Catholic Gardiner, weathered the storms, but he had some unhappy years. Cheke ended

his life miserably with exile, imprisonment, and recantation. Henry VIII was responsible for only the beginning of these troubles, and the later burning of Latimer, Ridley, and Cranmer at Oxford may appear to have been a much greater and more direct blow to learning than the execution of More. Apart from such eminent victims, the history of most of the colleges throughout the period reveals continual disturbance and continual changing of masters, according as the reforming or the conservative party got the upper hand. And there was a vast amount of ecclesiastical controversy, ranging from Henry's divorce to the Eucharist. Amid such unrest, such vicissitudes, and such polemics, the wonder is that humanism did not suffer far more than it did.

Modern writers often assign as a major cause for the decline of the universities and of education in general the dissolution of the monasteries and along with them of monastic schools. Much of the mist of sentimental nostalgia and prejudice which has clung about that business has been dispelled by a number of recent historians. The latest of these, Mr. Geoffrey Baskerville, has shown that a long overdue process of nationalization was carried out in a remarkably careful and equitable manner, with remarkably generous provision for dispossessed monks and nuns. While Mr. Baskerville has not much to say about the effect of the dissolution on education, his verdict is that the effect was small, since monastic educational effort had long been declining. The dispersal of monastic libraries is a lamentable fact which does not concern us here, but something can be said of the relation between the monasteries and the schools and universities.

Medieval statutes required monastic houses to keep a teacher to instruct the monks in grammar, logic, and

philosophy, and to send one out of every twenty monks to a university to learn theology or canon law. It does not appear that these rules were very effectively observed, at least in the period under discussion. In his visitation of so important a centre as Canterbury, in 1511, Archbishop Warham complained of the lack of a teacher and of the monks' ignorance of even the services. The general evidence of monastic laxity gives small ground for such a statement as that of Mullinger, the historian of Cambridge, that the dissolution, in cutting off the supply of students from the monasteries, must have caused a temporary diminution in numbers at the universities "scarcely less serious than would result, in the present day, from a sudden diversion of those educated at the public schools." Such an estimate, indeed, is scarcely borne out by the facts and figures in Mullinger's own pages.

The dissolution no doubt had its indirect consequences. Scholars were afraid that the universities would follow the monasteries. But when in 1545 the act for the dissolution of the colleges was passed, the royal commissioners, through the contrivance of Sir Thomas Smith, were chosen from among university men. On receiving their report, says Matthew Parker, the king diligently perused it, and then "in a certen admiration saide to certen of his Lords which stode by that he thought he had not in his realme so many persons so honestly mayntayned in lyvyng bi so little lond and rent." Accordingly, instead of dissolving the colleges, Henry endowed the splendid foundation of Trinity College, Cambridge, an embodiment of the new learning whose chief men were drawn from that nursery of humanism, St. John's. A decade earlier Henry had begun the refoundation of Wolsey's Cardinal College. The king is often blamed

both for not using monastic funds for college endowments and for using them. At any rate his chief immediate precedents for building colleges out of confiscated abbeys were furnished by those patrons of learning whom Mr. Chambers rightly admires, the saintly Fisher and the less saintly Wolsey. And one might add William of Wykeham and William of Wayneflete, for in fact Henry was only doing on a large scale what had been done for ages on a small one.

The dissolution is also commonly said to have injured education by destroying schools. We might recall Mr. Chambers's remark, one of his many charges against Henry, that More's school of St. Antony "was only one of a vast number which withered away." Mr. Chambers may be said to take a long view; St. Antony's School did wither away—in the middle of the seventeenth century. Since it is impossible to go into detail about schools, I must fall back on A. F. Leach, whose lifetime of research made his work so solid that subsequent writers have not found much to alter. I cite Leach not only because of his general authority, but because long study modified his own view of Henry. In his first book, *English Schools at the Reformation* (1896), he was not too friendly to the king. In his last book, *The Schools of Medieval England* (1915), he was led to such general judgments as these:

> Henry VIII's chief work in education consisted in refoundation and improvement, not in creation of new schools, but he did it on a scale which entitles him to the praise of being, in a sense, the greatest of school founders.
>
> It has been commonly assumed that in abolishing the monasteries he abolished a large number of schools. . . . This assumption is founded on the erroneous notion that the monasteries were or kept schools. . . .
>
> The schools which Henry abolished in abolishing the monasteries were the small and insignificant almonry schools of a few

charity boys, and these he more than replaced by the great schools which he established in the new cathedral foundations.

The abolition of the greater monasteries in 1540 resulted in the refoundation of twelve grammar schools as part of the cathedrals "of the new foundation". . . . In all the new cathedrals established in 1541 . . . a grammar school, with a master and usher paid on the highest scale of the day, was included. . . .

The Schools thus refounded did the greater part of the education of England till the eighteenth century.

While some of these cathedral schools may not have got actively under way in Henry's time, the main facts stand. He doubtless would have done more still if the expenses of war had not come first. This advance in secondary education under Henry would have gone further in the next reign if the avowed intention of the early acts of Edward's Council had been carried out. First, all chantry priests were ordered to exercise themselves in teaching the young. This subsidiary duty of the numerous chantry priests had been much neglected, and individual bishops, such as Hugh Latimer, had already issued diocesan injunctions about it. Then the lands of chantries were taken over with the object of promoting education and charity in addition to eradicating Roman Catholicism. But money was needed for war with Scotland, chantry lands were sold, and many schools, left unprovided for, disappeared. It is to be observed that the chief contemporary laments come in and around 1550, from such divines as Lever, Latimer, and Becon. These men, though vigorous Protestants, seem to be thinking of Edward's time and of Edward's rapacious courtiers rather than of Henry's. But even these laments, as we shall see, convict themselves of rhetorical excess.

The names of Latimer and Lever remind us of another cause of a fall in enrolment at the universities. Hitherto,

says Latimer in 1549-50, the universities had been open to poor men's sons like himself, but the great increase in rents has crippled the yeoman class and limited higher education to the sons of the wealthy. On the other hand, the middle and upper classes were growing richer, and both the newly rich and the old aristocratic families saw the attractions of the universities for their sons. There is a good deal of testimony from such men as Latimer, Lever, Walter Haddon, Ascham, Caius, and William Harrison, about the decrease in poor and industrious students and the increase in wealthy idlers. Yet again we must allow for the academic instinct to regret the good old times. When we look back to those times we find, for instance, that many middle-aged priests had been deserting their parishes in order to enjoy the tavern side of college life; an Act of 1536 compelled all over forty to return to their cures, and those under forty to give proof of diligence in study. As for the increasing number of wealthy idlers who did not take degrees, we know that, during the first years of Elizabeth at least, the number of students at Cambridge was increasing very rapidly, but the proportion of B.A. degrees was increasing more rapidly still.

After laming ourselves with reasons we might wonder that the universities were still existing at all. But the depression does not seem to have been so serious as early and modern commentators have said it was. By telescoping bits from different sermons Mr. Chambers makes Latimer in 1550 appear to report ten thousand fewer students at Cambridge than there had been twenty years before. Latimer does not name any institution when he gives the figure of ten thousand, and if he had Cambridge in mind he was using very round numbers indeed; in 1564, when the registration had been rising for years, the total

number of students at Cambridge was 1,267. What Latimer is always deploring is the falling-off in divinity students. At Cambridge in 1549-51 there were two doctors of divinity and fourteen bachelors; twenty years before, in 1529-31, there had been eleven of each. The decline does not seem overwhelming. In degrees of all kinds, the number fell from an average of 93 during 1522-33 to an average of 78 in the next decade. Mullinger puts the greatest depression at both universities in the years 1542-8; yet at the beginning of that period we have Ascham rejoicing in a golden age at Cambridge, and at the end of it we have Walter Haddon declaring that he had never seen the university more affluent or more thronged. And Mullinger admits that during those six dark years the number of B.A. degrees was only slightly smaller than during the six years of Edward's reign. Further, unfortunately for those who make Mary's reign the dark era, the number of B.A.'s during her five years was 195, compared with 167 during the last five years of Edward. At Oxford, according to Sir Charles Mallet, the registers do not indicate any sharp fall under Edward, nor, unless in divinity, any special decline from Edward to Mary. Here one might pause to wonder about the sources of this fairly steady flow of university students, a flow which markedly increased from the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. Was the destruction of schools, even under Edward, so wholesale as many early and recent commentators have made out?

Contemporary witnesses, like modern ones, contradicted one another, and some, like Ascham, contradicted themselves. Men's vision was strongly coloured by religious and political as well as personal prejudice. Further, like academic men in all ages, they were much given to hasty expressions of rhetorical pessimism. There

was disagreement not only between Protestants and Catholics but among Protestants as to the nature and causes of the decline in learning; a main theme on both sides was the fear of an inadequate supply of learned clergy. I have used some figures about enrolment because modern historians have so often been content to echo the vague lamentations of contemporaries or of Fuller and Anthony Wood. In that respect the decline seems to have been much exaggerated. The more important and difficult question of a decline in morale we have partly touched, and here too we may think the case somewhat overdrawn, though at best it was serious enough.

In this brief sketch of the educational problem something has been said incidentally in defence of Henry VIII. While I am not trying to whitewash him, but only to remove a few layers of the mud indiscriminately hurled by Mr. Chambers, I should like to add a few words more about Henry's policy and achievement. We have observed his founding or refounding of important schools and colleges. He seriously desired to provide a supply of educated men for the service of state and church, and one piece of evidence is the establishment of scholarships. In 1536 a royal injunction required every priest with emoluments of one hundred pounds or more to maintain a scholar at a university or grammar school. We do not know how effective this rule was, but it may be supposed to have worked pretty well, since it was re-enacted under Edward and again under Elizabeth. One minor but not insignificant advance was the authorization of what was called Lily's *Grammar* as the text-book in all grammar schools.

For further evidence of Henry's support of education and the new learning one may quote the injunctions to

Cambridge of 1535. "He inciteth them to the study of tongues. . . . He enjoineth them to fcund, on the joint cost of all the Colleges, two Lectures, the one of Latin, the other of Greek, to be daily read, (and, by consequence, heard), on great penalties." Duns Scotus and his tribe are banished, along with canon law, and in their place is required the study of Aristotle, Rudolph Agricola, Melanchthon, and others. The "Master of the Sentences" is to give way to the Bible. Mr. Chambers's sniff at Henry's few readerships presumably includes not only the lectureships just mentioned but the Regius Professorships founded at Cambridge and Oxford, which from the first had some distinguished incumbents and greatly stimulated learning in Greek, Hebrew, Civil Law, Medicine, and Theology. In regard to all these reforms it may be said that Henry himself was not bearing the cost, or that the ideas were not original with him. To frame an answer on the lowest possible level, one may say first, according to an ancient proverb, that a thief gives all he does not take, and, secondly, on the same principle, that a ruler deserves credit for all the acts he does not veto.

Let us recall the Phillimore-Chambers theory of the effect of More's execution: "In England, all learning felt the blow, and shrank. It was not till the days of Bentley that classical scholarship recovered in England the position it held in the days of Erasmus, before Henry axed it." Erasmus' teaching of Greek at Cambridge in 1511-4 may have given a great impetus to the English Reformation, but in the matter of Greek scholarship it was a sad disillusionment for the teacher. Greek did not really begin at Cambridge until 1518, when Richard Croke was brought, under Henry's auspices, from an illustrious professorship at Leipsig. Henry was not responsible for the prolonged hostility to Greek which broke out in the

"Trojan" war at Oxford in the same year. Nor did Henry dictate Gardiner's fierce and repeated decrees against the reformed pronunciation of Greek inaugurated by Smith and Cheke, decrees which, said Ascham in his impetuous way, almost extinguished all zeal for learning in Cambridge. In these things, and in others which must be passed by, we have, not at all the effect of More's execution, but the bitter antagonism of Catholic adherents of the old learning, whose attitude toward Greek and humanism was generally very different from More's. The reactionaries would have kept the universities tied to degenerate scholasticism if it had not been for a few powerful supporters of humanism, and, though full honour is due to such men as Fisher and Fox, the dominant factor was that Henry was on the side of the new learning.

We might name an unbroken succession of eminent classical scholars throughout the long blank period that Mr. Chambers deplores, but we can glance at only the beginning of it, say the dozen years following the death of More, when the paralysis of humanism might be supposed to be at its worst. And as soon as we look at those years, we realize that we are considering the one period in English history before Bentley when classical studies in an English university were a matter of international fame, when Sir John Cheke taught Cambridge and King Edward Greek. At Cambridge, in this period of arrested humanism, we have, in addition to Cheke and Sir Thomas Smith, both Regius Professors, Ascham himself, William Grindall, William Cecil, Thomas Watson, James Pilkington, and William Bill. Of these men all but Smith were at St. John's. Among other notable scholars in the two universities were Walter Haddon, John Ponet, John Redman, Robert Pember, John Caius, Thomas Wilson, Nicholas Carr, Nicholas Ridley, John

Aylmer, Matthew Parker. Nearly all these men were Protestants. Catholics were not paralysed by the death of More; they were in general, as I said, exponents of the old learning, even when, as in some cases, they were not unfriendly to the new. Here we might recall that young friend of More, Thomas Lupset, who would have been an ornament of this age if he had not died in early manhood. And, though he was not an academic man, one should name Sir Thomas Elyot, one of the most authentic humanists of the century. Of these names many, of course, mean little now except to scholars, but in their day—or should one say in their night?—they were bright beacons, and a respectable number of them are important still. Among the successors of Colet and More one could not ask for better exemplars of Christian humanism than Cheke and Ascham. That the later pair are of smaller stature Phillimore and Chambers would perhaps explain by saying (after *1066 and All That*) that they were not angels but Anglicans.

One general point urged by Phillimore, and at least implied by Mr. Chambers, seems to me fundamental. No Tudor classical scholar, says Phillimore, can be compared for a moment with Lambin and Turnèbe; classical scholarship in England, say both men, did not recover itself until the days of Bentley. In other words, the failure in England to produce any great works of pure scholarship is a mark of arrested development. So far as the humanists were drawn into ecclesiastical controversy, we may regret the conditions which fostered much vain writing and speaking, but otherwise the notion of arrested development betrays a misunderstanding of the vital spirit of English humanism. Of course a number of the humanists wrote little or nothing because, like the fifteenth-century humanists before them, they were busy

academic and ecclesiastical administrators—or perhaps they seemed busier than they were. Moreover, the mere burden of teaching borne by such men as Cheke was far greater than that of modern professors. But the real truth lies much deeper than these external circumstances, and it is strange that Phillimore and Mr. Chambers, in contemplating their idol, should not have been saved from an obvious fallacy. More did not seek to rival Scaliger, nor did Erasmus envy the reputation of Budé. Erasmus and More did not investigate the coinage or the grammar of the ancients; they sought to make the rational wisdom of antiquity supplement the teaching of Christ. "You," wrote Erasmus to Budé, "have preferred to be understood by the learned, I, if I can, by the many; your aim is to conquer, mine to teach or persuade." The main impulse of Tudor humanism, and of the best continental humanism, was not that life should be given up to classical learning, but that classical learning should be an aid to the active Christian life. *The Praise of Folly* and *Utopia*, *The Governour* and *The Schoolmaster*, remain living books. Who except the scholar has heard of Lambin and Turnèbe, and how many scholars could say fifty words about either? I am not disparaging the work of these and other men who did so much to enlarge and purify classical learning, but we should never forget that the purpose of Tudor humanism was education. The broad aim was training in virtue and good letters, the special aim was preparing young men for public life. It was these Tudor humanists who established what was to remain the ruling motive of English classical study down to the days of "the Jowett mind." Would it have been better that William Cecil should continue as a classical don, and perhaps crown his life with an edition of Aristotle's *Politics*, than that he

should apply ancient wisdom to practical statesmanship—not without help from Machiavelli? Classical scholars, poor and simple, have always been rare accidents in England. For scholarship means discovery, humanism means discipline. A. E. Housman (like Bentley) believed that the function of a classical scholar in these times was the emending of texts, preferably those of bad poets. Erasmus and More, and Cheke and Ascham and Smith, would have given their approval to Sir Alfred Zimmern and Professor Gilbert Murray for working at Geneva.

So, instead of talking of the blank in classical scholarship down to the days of Bentley, I should say that the appearance of Bentley marked the death of classical humanism. When literature ceases to be studied as a guide to life, the zest for discovery begins. The modern world has long abandoned the didactic and religious view of literature which the best Renaissance humanists held, in common with most of the ancients, and far more has been lost than has been gained in the process. The chief loss was to humanism itself. Renaissance humanism did not rise, as is commonly said, in opposition to theology and religion; it rose mainly in opposition to irreligious and "unhuman" science and philosophy. It strove, as so many movements have striven, to reassert human values, which meant also divine values, against barren logic or a philosophy of nature which neglected the truly human and divine. When the life finally went out of Christian humanism, when the study of literature and rhetoric was divorced from the pursuit of virtue, science regained the ascendancy it had held in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. To hungry sheep who felt that they were being fed on husks, the scientists seemed to offer something real. Contemplating a good deal of modern literary scholarship, including one's own minute share in it (but not including

Mr. Chambers's robust work), one might be tempted to draw a moral for the present. One might even have the quaint thought that if many of us Renaissance scholars had lived during the Renaissance, we would have been unregenerate Scotists, wrapped up in our quiddities. But it is more discreet to stop here. "Saint Socrates, pray for us."

BEYOND THE GRADUATE SCHOOLS: THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

ABRAHAM FLEXNER

FOR more than half a century preceding the outbreak of the Great War in 1914 American scholars and scientists, who for the most part had already received a Ph.D. degree at Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Chicago, or elsewhere, and who desired further and usually informal opportunities for research under the direction of a great master, often resorted to one of the German universities. A few found such opportunities in America, a few others in Great Britain, France, or elsewhere, but Germany was the Mecca for an overwhelmingly large percentage of them.

The War put an immediate stop to study of the kind which I have just indicated. In the first place, foreigners were less welcome and after America entered the War, intercourse was entirely suspended. In the second place, the universities were themselves badly disorganized by the War; younger professors took their predestined places in the German army, and older professors, especially in the natural sciences, were drawn upon for various technical services arising out of new needs connected with submarine, aerial, or other warfare. Finally, in the course of the War the university laboratories were more or less dismantled because of the constant demand upon them by the army for materials like copper and lead, which were requisite for the waging of a modern war.

When peace came, Germany was an impoverished, a defeated, and a discouraged country. The reorganization of the universities, as they had existed prior to 1914, was a herculean task. A great minister of education,

Carl Becker, devoted some years of his life to this important work and achieved far more than one might have supposed possible; but, as the years wore on and the universities were overcrowded with students because opportunities in other fields were limited, Becker found his task increasingly difficult. Even prior to the Hitler régime he was regarded with suspicion because of his frankly democratic ideas. He was supplanted, and fortunately for him did not live to witness the havoc which has been wrought by those who have been responsible for higher education in Germany since 1933.

As far back as 1922 when I was still secretary of the General Education Board, I was impressed by the need for developing in America an institution that would do for American scholarship and science what, at their best, European universities had done, and in that year I prepared a memorandum in which I pointed out the need and suggested that it could be met by the reorganization of an existing American university. Nothing came of this memorandum, but eight years later when I was engaged in preparing for publication the lectures on *Universities*, given under the auspices of the Rhodes Trust at Oxford in 1928, I was asked my opinion as to the use to which a considerable fortune ought to, and could best, be put. I replied that I could answer only in so far as the field of education was concerned and that within that field the time had, in my judgment, come for the creation of an institute for advanced study, preferably associated with an existing university, so as to avoid unnecessary duplication of plants, apparatus, and men. My suggestion was carried to Mr. Louis Bamberger and his sister, Mrs. Felix Fuld, of Newark, New Jersey, since, as I then learned, the inquiry had emanated from them. They accepted the idea, stipulating only that I should under-

take to organize and start it. I agreed to do so, and within a few weeks the Institute for Advanced Study (as it was named) was equipped with a board of trustees and a charter.

The next two years were spent by me in visiting American and foreign universities as a preliminary to deciding upon the precise organization of the proposed institute, the field or fields in which it should make its beginning, and the location which we should select. I ultimately decided to recommend to the Board that we should begin with a single subject in order to test the validity of the idea, and I chose mathematics because in the first place it required so little in the way of equipment and in the second place because there was no subject in which it was easier to obtain agreement as to the personnel of a faculty.

During the preliminary period of two years the Institute occupied temporary offices in New York City and consisted of myself and my secretary, Mrs. Esther S. Bailey, who had for almost fifteen years previously been my secretary and assistant at the General Education Board. After careful consideration it was decided to locate the Institute at Princeton, New Jersey. There were two reasons for this choice: in the first place, Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld recognized an obligation to the people of New Jersey; in the second place, Princeton was a relatively small university with a rigidly limited graduate school which already possessed a strong mathematical faculty—the so-called Princeton group—and developing faculties in other branches. When I explained what was in my mind to President Hibben, he invited us at once to share the beautiful mathematical building, Fine Hall, which Princeton University had recently erected. On President Hibben's retirement Mr. Edward

D. Duffield became acting president. To these two gentlemen, to the late Dean Trowbridge of the Graduate College and to his successor, Dean Eisenhart, who is also chairman of the University Faculty of Mathematics, and indeed to all members of the Princeton faculty and to the trustees of the University, the Institute owes a debt of gratitude for the gracious and helpful reception which it met at the beginning and has received continuously since. At the close of the year Mr. Duffield retired as acting president and was succeeded by Dr. Harold W. Dodds, previously professor of politics. President Dodds has co-operated with the Institute in the most generous and sympathetic fashion, and as a result, after four years of activity, during which two additional schools have been opened, namely, humanistic studies and economics and politics, the two institutions have collaborated so intimately that the resources of each have been made available to the other upon the most informal terms.

As the Institute for Advanced Study now stands, it possesses three schools, as they are called: the School of Mathematics, School of Humanistic Studies, and School of Economics and Politics. The schools are practically autonomous. The faculty of each school manages its own affairs with such occasional conferences with the director as they may deem advisable or necessary. Members are admitted for one or more years on the recommendation of the several faculties. Those admitted in this capacity have all received the Ph.D. degree and have almost without exception either through teaching or research given promise of further development. On their arrival in Princeton the temporary members confer with some faculty member and decide in this informal fashion upon what they propose to do. Certain seminars or lecture courses are given, but there is no formality whatsoever.

Anyone, who is a member of either the University or the Institute, may attend or not, as he pleases. There are no specific entrance prerequisites. There are no examinations at the close of the academic year. No certificates or diplomas are awarded, so that there is nothing to induce a young scholar to come to the Institute for a year or more except the prospect of working with some master in one of the fields above mentioned. A bulletin is annually issued about the middle of the year, describing in general terms what is likely to be offered during the following year. This bulletin can be had upon application.

The eminence of the various faculties has drawn to Princeton annually during each of the years of its existence not only younger men but distinguished professors and associate professors from almost every American state, from Canada, and from practically every centre of university activity in Europe and Asia. It would be invidious to endeavour to give a list of the faculties in this connection, but it will not be amiss to say that our most eminent member is Professor Einstein, who for the past four years has lived continuously in Princeton and has devoted his entire time to his researches and to the encouragement of members of the School of Mathematics and of visiting scientists from all portions of the globe.

Up to this time the Institute has been without a building of its own. Through the courtesy of Princeton University, its School of Mathematics has occupied space in Fine Hall. Through the courtesy of the University, part of the humanistic group has been housed in McCormick Hall, the home of the distinguished Department of Art and Archaeology of Princeton University. Other members of the humanistic group have worked in their own homes or have shared with the School of Economics

and Politics temporary quarters in a wooden building. The offices occupy a few rented rooms on Nassau Street, the main thoroughfare of this small town. Books and periodicals are being gradually acquired. A large Greek epigraphical collection has been made by Professor Meritt, and the Gest Oriental Library has been acquired, though it has not yet been opened for workers in the field of Chinese language and literature.

In general, the Institute has followed the policy which was practised by President Gilman in the early days of the Johns Hopkins University. It has concentrated its income upon men, utilizing any available makeshift for space. There will come a time when a building will undoubtedly be necessary, but until the Institute expands, which it is, however, unlikely to do in the near future, the need of a separate building is not urgent.

THE ORIGINALITY OF BERNARDIN DE SAINT-PIERRE

F. C. Green

IT IS an English tradition to deplore the lack of imagination displayed by French writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Before endorsing this opinion, however, it might be well to examine its general implications. This verdict embraces the dramatic creations of Corneille, Racine, and Molière, the fairy-tales of Perrault and his school, the fables of La Fontaine, and the remarkable suite of novels which, from the middle of the seventeenth century until the Revolution, illustrate the variety and richness of the French inventive genius. It implies that no imagination was required to conceive the comedies of Regnard, Dancourt, Marivaux, and Beaumarchais, and assumes that by a purely rational process the French presented Europe with a new type of play, *le drame*, and brought to perfection the genre known as the *opéra comique*. Finally, it ignores the fact that Rousseau and Bernardin de Saint-Pierre first showed the novelists of Europe how to observe and to exploit the artistic possibilities of external nature in their fictions.

In the last fifty years, it is true, we have agreed to regard Rousseau as an honourable exception, mainly because Rousseau was a Swiss. Otherwise, the Anglo-Saxon attitude to the French writers of the old régime has undergone small change. Our critics are willing to grant them every quality—reason, wit, elegance, realism, intelligence—everything save imagination. It is not hard to discover the cause of this peculiar obstinacy. For the Anglo-Saxon, imagination is inseparable from imagery. A truly imaginative writer, in the English

sense, is one who quite naturally subordinates reason to sensibility, and regards beauty of form, unity and clarity of expression, as of relatively small account. For him, the imagination begins to become creative only when its images produce in the reader's mind a feeling of intense sensual excitement, when, careless of form, the writer chooses words and images for their picturesque qualities, their ability to evoke reverie and mystery. And to be perfectly just, because of the absence of these elements, we usually include in the category of unimaginative literature the bulk of our own eighteenth-century writings.

To such heights the French eighteenth-century imagination, even in the case of Rousseau, never attained, although *La Nouvelle Héloïse* contains passages where in the ecstasy of reverie, Jean-Jacques discovers language of rare and lyrical voluptuousness. But nowhere does he cross the barrier dividing the rational from the supernatural, so that even when his heroine speaks of the world beyond, it is always in terms of the world in which she lives. Never is her language illuminated by the "light that never was, on sea or land." There is nothing Miltonic or even Ossianic in the visions of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Yet his novel unlocked the gates which had pent up a flood of indescribable desires and yearnings. Thousands found in the pages of *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, the expression of their longings for romance, for beauty and tranquillity of soul. It was a sanctuary to which many weary hearts escaped and found a refuge from the incurable ennui of everyday existence. But the romantic spirit is by nature insatiable. For a time, entranced by its new climate, it basks in the illusion of contentment. But that illusion is momentary: to live, the romantic spirit must extend its explorations until that fatal hour when, having no new worlds to conquer, it sinks back

into its primitive and mortal ennui. That stage, however, the French romantic souls of the eighteenth century never knew: that bitter experience they bequeathed to their children of the next age. Meanwhile, for those who were tired of Rousseau's happy valley in Switzerland, there was Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's vision of the New World.

Living in an era given up to publicity, when every trumpery novel is presented to us in staring headlines as a masterpiece, we need some effort to imagine what is really meant by a literary event. For the French public of 1787, *Paul et Virginie* blazed out with all the force of a revelation. It refreshed and invigorated the spirit of a whole generation and its repercussions were felt for many decades, surviving even the spell cast over France by the author of *Atala*. It was translated into every language in Europe: it produced three hundred imitations in French alone; it was dramatized and became the subject of pictures and romances. The illumination produced by *Paul et Virginie* was spontaneous and unexpected. Bernardin de Saint-Pierre presented to the imagination of his contemporaries a strange and exotic land drenched with light, colour, and music, a land inhabited by sensitive souls who had found there a refuge from the sophistication and the drabness of civilized life. He told a sad but ineffably sweet story of perfect love destined never to be fulfilled in this world. To Bernardin's readers, contemplating the life of Paul and Virginie, it was as if the first man and woman walked the earth again. Thus love first arose in the human heart and thus it first expressed itself. The novel achieved the miracle of pleasing both the *âmes sensibles* and the *philosophes*. Indeed, there is hardly one movement of eighteenth-century French thought which is not caught and re-

flected in its prism. In plot and character-construction, Saint-Pierre is guilty of that *simplisme* which is the fault of all novelists who write in view of a thesis. But he was also a cunning artist with a keen eye for pattern, colour, rhythm, and plastic attitudes. Sometimes, no doubt, his technique is naïvely obvious and, in consequence, misses the desired effect. Yet there are interesting discoveries to be made in *Paul et Virginie*.

In every good novel there is a kind of constant relationship between the setting and the action: it is this which lends to the work its unity of tone and also that indefinable quality vaguely termed "atmosphere." This relationship may imply harmony or contrast, but in either case it determines the illusion of veracity and, consequently, the success of the artist. Balzac and Chesterton, for example, both produce their effects by a contrast between *milieu* and action though it is obvious to the most untutored reader that the Frenchman is infinitely superior to the Englishman. Why is this? Chesterton succeeds in creating an eerie and sinister atmosphere by his exaggerated and paradoxical opposition of elements, as, for example, when he tells the story of a brutal murder which takes place in a pleasant English village on a sunny summer's day. The whole philosophy of his Father Brown series rests, in fact, on such a dissociation of ideas, on the assumption that these inversions of the normal order are only abnormal to the unobservant eye. But though Chesterton diverts his reader, he fails to convince him: he breaks the illusion of truth. Now Balzac makes it seem not only natural but inevitable that the humdrum pension of Mme Vauquer or Sophie Gamard's house in the shadow of the cathedral should be the environment of a Vautrin or a Troubert, those monstrous incarnations of demonic ambition or Tar-

tuffian duplicity. Here the art lies in the gradual revelation of this inevitable relationship. It is the difference between drama and melodrama.

In *Paul et Virginie*, however, we must not look for drama in the Balzacian sense. It opens on a note of elegy which pervades the tone of the whole novel. And this opening movement derives from a constant and rhythmic interdependence of the setting, the events, and the characters. Like Prévost in *Manon Lescaut*, Bernardin begins by giving us a glimpse of the stage after the play is over. Here is the quiet valley in Mauritius where Paul and Virginie passed their halcyon days. Here are the two cabins which sheltered Mme de la Tour and Marguerite with their faithful slaves, Domingue and Marie. Overshadowing them are the green and brown slopes of the mountains that shut them in. Within this enclosure life is peaceful and joyous like the air, the water, and the light. But beyond the rocky summits of these heights lies the vast ocean with its sinister, jagged reefs dominating the restless and treacherous waters. There Paul and Virginie met their doom. Once outside the sanctuary, their primitive natural goodness fell a prey to the storms of passion and was destroyed by the evils inseparable from civilization. Now they are gone. The cabins moulder in the dust and of all who frequented them only one remains, the venerable man who alone remembers what happened in that pleasant valley and tells its story. He too is a symbol, the symbol of the fugacity of life and of passion. Soon he will disappear and with him the last vestiges of that brief contact between human and earthly beauty. For Saint-Pierre does not share the Lamartinian illusion that nature will preserve the memory of human happiness and suffering.

This interdependence of setting and action in *Paul*

et Virginie is constant. That is the pattern of the novel. The tranquillity and sweetness of the emotions and events are reflected in the radiance and beauty of the physical environment. So also, the tempests of the soul are given their appropriate natural *milieu*. This idea, which in later writers was to degenerate into a *cliché*, Saint-Pierre was the first to exploit with art in the novel.

The theme implicit in the opening description, gradually acquires a larger significance. As the story unfolds, we realize that the author's ultimate intention is to illustrate the contrast between *la bonté naturelle* and the evils of civilization; in brief, to illuminate and to reinforce the favourite philosophy of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, whom he knew and admired. Virginie's mother, Mme de la Tour, marries out of her class and with her husband, takes refuge in Mauritius. Her husband dies and his widow seeks out a remote spot on the island where, accompanied by her negro servant, Domingue, she can abandon herself to the mercies of Nature and Providence. To the same place comes now Marguerite who is also a victim of social prejudice. Deserted by her lover, a nobleman who had seduced her under promise of marriage, she also finds a sanctuary in this sheltered valley. In picturing the destinies of these two women, Saint-Pierre, like Rousseau, infers that in a natural state, they would not have suffered for having yielded to their sensibility, since by "nature" we must here understand always that which is opposed to civilization. Mme de la Tour married: Marguerite did not. Yet both are unhappy because at some point they ran counter to the artificial laws invented by civilized man. It is, however, typical of the naïveté of Saint-Pierre's philosophy that he sees nothing unnatural in one person's owning another, so long as the slave is well treated, as is the case with

Domingue and Marie. It was not till the Revolution that the humanitarianism of eighteenth-century France was extended to embrace the black races, and even then largely in theory.

The cult of friendship, echoes of which are to be discerned in all the *drames* and novels of the second half of the century, is touchingly exemplified in the relations between Mme de la Tour and Marguerite. Friendship, says the novelist, is stronger even than the tie of blood.[1] This was a new conception of friendship, and, on reflection, it will be found to conceal one aspect of the general eighteenth-century criticism of traditional *mœurs*. In seventeenth-century literature, the stock theme of plays and novels was the conflict between love and filial duty, that is to say, between the sexual instinct and something which was then regarded also as an instinct. Now Saint-Pierre questions the belief that filial obedience is instinctive or natural. Is it not perhaps another social prejudice masquerading as a natural instinct and designed to preserve the fabric of a hierarchical and unnatural social order? In the pleadings of a lover or in the commands of a father or mother where is the voice of nature? Saint-Pierre implies that in such an impasse the only guide is our sensibility. And he tells us that Mme de la Tour had never detected in the attitude of her parents any sign of natural goodness: therefore she left them to follow her lover. This idea of friendship found its logical culmination in the Revolutionary cult of fraternity, later identified with obedience to the State, which took precedence over all other ties.

We now see why our author chose for his setting the Ile de France or, as it is now called, Mauritius. It

[1] *Paul et Virginie* (Nelson ed.), p. 8. All subsequent references are to this edition.

provided him with a plausible approximation to primitive conditions, or to what was then known as *l'état de nature.* In this valley, far removed from Port Louis, the capital, there are no social barriers: it is enough to be a neighbour to be entitled to hospitality and kindness. Mme de la Tour and Marguerite leave the division of their land to the old man who afterwards relates their history. But actually the idea of property does not exist. In one sense, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre may be said to have been anticipated here by Defoe, whose *Robinson Crusoe* he had eagerly read. Still, the picture he gives of the simple life led by these two women reminds one much more forcibly of Rousseau. It is the Clarens of *La Nouvelle Héloïse* transported to Mauritius.

Needless to say, Paul and Virginie are brought up according to the method laid down by Rousseau in *Emile.* "Jamais les sciences inutiles n'avaient fait couler leurs larmes" (p. 19). The girl learns to prepare the meals, to keep house, and to spin: Paul, like our first father, cultivates the soil. Apart from this, they were, says Saint-Pierre, as ignorant as creoles, knowing neither how to read nor write. That is because, unlike Emile, they are not being educated as citizens. There is no necessity here, to teach the principles of orthodox morality since in this natural *milieu* there are no evils or prejudices to guard against. Why warn children of the immorality of theft in a place where all is common property? Why talk of intemperance where luxuries are unknown; or of lying when there are no truths to conceal? Why speak of the punishments meted out to ungrateful children when that which links them to their parents is not a sense of dependence or of filial duty, but friendship? As to religion, it is unnecessary to remark that Mme de la Tour and Marguerite are faithful disciples of the *Vicaire*

savoyard. The God they worship is the God of Love who is present everywhere in nature. Art, too, is superfluous because in this happy climate nature supplies everything. At their door is a banana tree which gives them food ready to eat and leaves to take the place of table-linen.

Physically, Paul and Virginie are perfect: the natural man and woman.

> Une nourriture saine et abondante développait rapidement les corps de ces jeunes gens, et une éducation douce peignait dans leur physiognomie la pureté et le contentement de leur âme. Virginie n'avait que douze ans: déjà sa taille était plus qu'à demi formée; de grands cheveux blonds ombrageaient sa tête; ses yeux bleus et ses lèvres de corail brillaient du plus tendre éclat sur la fraîcheur de son visage; ils souriaient toujours de concert quand elle parlait; mais quand elle gardait le silence, leur obliquité naturelle vers le ciel leur donnait une expression d'une sensibilité extrême et même celle d'une légère mélancolie. Pour Paul, on voyait déjà se développer en lui le caractère d'un homme au milieu des grâces de l'adolescence. Sa taille était plus élevée que celle de Virginie, son teint plus rembruni, son nez plus aquilin; et ses yeux qui étaient noirs auraient eu un peu de fierté, si les longs cils qui rayonnaient autour comme des pinceaux ne leur avaient donné la plus grande douceur. . . . Mais à leurs regards qui cherchaient à se rencontrer, à leurs sourires rendus par de plus doux sourires, on les eût pris pour ces enfants du ciel, pour ces esprits bienheureux, dont la nature est de s'aimer, et qui n'ont pas besoin de rendre le sentiment par des pensées et l'amitié par des paroles [p. 20].

Gradually, however, this natural friendship is transformed into love, and now we touch an aspect of the novel which was immensely interesting to the *âmes sensibles* and *philosophes* of the century. The question of origins had passionately exercised the intelligent public ever since the beginning of the Regency. What was the psychology of primitive man? What was the origin of society and of the moral laws governing it? This curiosity explains the extraordinary vogue enjoyed by books

of travel such as Prévost's *Histoire générale des voyages*, the *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses écrites des missions étrangères*, and the *Voyages* of Anson, Cook, and Bougainville. Such writers satisfied no doubt the *exotisme* of the age—its craving for the far-away and picturesque. But, as Saint-Pierre very well knew, his readers would not be wholly content merely with vivid descriptions of the gorgeous tropical setting in which his hero and heroine grew to maturity. The proper study of mankind was still largely man. The public wanted to know about the origins of the so-called natural passions, above all the passion of love. In a trifling one-act play, *La Dispute* (1744), Marivaux had imagined the extraordinary case of an experimental scientist who for eighteen years had kept two boys and two girls completely isolated from the opposite sex, and his comedy revealed what happens at their first meeting. Love, we discover, originates in *amour-propre* or jealousy. This interest in origins had its roots, of course, in the contemporary mania for experimental or Newtonian science: and a good example of it is to be found in Diderot's *Supplément au voyage de Bougainville*, in which, by an objective examination of the manners of the Tahitians, he attempts to establish by induction certain general objections to our current principles of morality. But Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's readers were less exigent. Their curiosity was less scientific than Diderot's, and in some cases it derived from a jaded and sensual ennui which sought escape in the quest for new and piquant sensations. Yet these were probably in the minority. For the large number, the desire to contemplate the dawn of love in Bernardin's children of nature was inspired by sheer excess of sensibility. In either case, it is clear that *Paul et Virginie*

possessed attractions which appealed to every category of reader.

Saint-Pierre approaches his task with considerable skill. A runaway slave throws himself on the children's mercy and is taken back by them to her owner, a brutal planter. He, with many oaths, consents to pardon the slave because of Virginie's touching beauty. The incident is brought in for two reasons: first, to contrast the natural goodness of Paul and Virginie with the cruelty of the European, and secondly to reveal to Virginie that her beauty gives her power over another white man than Paul. The latter feels instinctively impelled to boast that he would have thrashed the slave-owner for Virginie's sake had he refused her request. "Comment," she says naïvely, "avec cet homme si grand et si méchant?" From that moment there is a subtle change in their relations, for this is the dawn of love. Love then, according to Saint-Pierre, is inspired by Paul's instinctive jealousy of the other male. He implies, surely, that love is always possession at the expense of someone else and that jealousy or *amour-propre* is as necessary to the birth of love as shadow is to light.

On the journey home, Paul and Virginie lose themselves but are rescued by Domingue in the last stages of exhaustion. The whole adventure leaves a profound impression on the minds of Paul and Virginie. Their attitude towards each other is altered, and the change is reflected in the new tone of their conversation. "Au matin de la vie, ils en avaient toute la fraîcheur: tels dans le jardin d'Eden parurent nos premiers parents, lorsque, sortant des mains de Dieu, ils se virent, s'approchèrent et conversèrent d'abord comme frère et soeur: Virginie, douce, modeste, confiante comme Eve; et Paul, semblable à Adam, ayant la taille d'un homme avec la

simplicité d'un enfant" (pp. 66-7). But it is in the language of the *Song of Songs* that Paul tries to express to Virginie the emotions aroused in him by her charms, her sweetness and beauty. And she, recurring to the episode of the runaway slave, confesses: "Tu m'es cher depuis le jour où tu voulais te battre pour moi contre le maître de cette esclave." Now she wants him always near her, and when he goes away, Virginie is seized with sharp anxiety for his safety. Gradually she becomes a prey to strange emotions.

Virginie se sentait agitée d'un mal inconnu. Ses beaux yeux bleus se marbraient de noir; son teint jaunissait; une langueur universelle abattait son corps. La sérénité n'était plus sur son front ni le sourire sur ses lèvres. On la voyait tout à coup gaie sans joie, et triste sans chagrin. Elle fuyait ses jeux innocents, ses doux travaux, et la société de sa famille bien-aimée. Elle errait çà et là dans les lieux les plus solitaires de l'habitation, cherchant partout du repos et ne le trouvant nulle part. Quelquefois à la vue de Paul, elle allait vers lui en folâtrant; puis tout à coup, près de l'aborder, un embarras subit la saisissait, un rouge vif colorait ses joues pâles, et ses yeux s'arrêtaient sur les siens [pp. 69-70].

Saint-Pierre, in describing the psychological crisis through which Virginie now passes, insists, as before, on the secret harmony between nature and man. Virginie's state of soul is reflected in the mood of nature. With a mastery of impressionism undreamed of in French literature, the novelist interprets every nuance of the ominous hush that precedes a tropical storm.

Un de ces étés qui désolent de temps à autre les terres situées entre les tropiques vint étendre ici ses ravages. C'était vers la fin de décembre, lorsque le soleil, au Capricorne, échauffe pendant trois semaines l'Ile-de-France de ses feux verticaux. Le vent du sud-est, qui y règne presque toute l'année, n'y soufflait plus. De longs tourbillons de poussière s'élevaient sur les chemins, et restaient suspendus en l'air. La terre se fendait de toutes parts; l'herbe était brûlée, des exhalaisons chaudes sortaient du flanc des mon-

tagnes, et la plupart de leurs ruisseaux étaient desséchés. Aucun nuage ne venait du côté de la mer. Seulement, pendant le jour, des vapeurs rousses s'élevaient de dessus les plaines, et paraissaient, au coucher du soleil, comme les flammes d'un incendie. La nuit même n'apportait aucun rafraîchissement à l'atmosphère embrasée. L'orbe de la lune, tout rouge, se levait dans un horizon embrumé, d'une grandeur démesurée. Les troupeaux abattus sur les flancs des collines, le cou tendu vers le ciel, aspirant l'air, faisaient retentir les vallons de tristes gémissements. Le Cafre même qui les conduisait se couchait sur la terre pour y trouver de la fraîcheur: mais partout le sol était brûlant, et l'air étouffant retentissait du bourdonnement des insectes, qui cherchaient à se désaltérer dans le sang des hommes et des animaux [pp. 70-2].

This forms an admirable prelude to the celebrated nocturne of Virginie's visit to the pool by the spring, a symbolic episode which marks the climax of her soul-crisis.

Dans une de ces nuits ardentes, Virginie sentit redoubler tous les symptômes de son mal. Elle se levait, elle s'asseyait, elle se recouchait et ne trouvait dans aucune attitude ni le sommeil ni le repos. Elle s'achemine, à la clarté de la lune, vers sa fontaine. Elle en aperçoit la source, qui, malgré la sécheresse, coulait encore en filets d'argent sur les flancs bruns du rocher. Elle se plonge dans son bassin. D'abord la fraîcheur ranime ses sens, et mille souvenirs agréables se présentent à son esprit. Elle se rappelle que, dans son enfance, sa mère et Marguerite s'amusaient à la baigner avec Paul dans ce même lieu; que Paul ensuite, réservant ce bain pour elle seule, en avait creusé le lit, couvert le fond de sable, et semé sur ses bords des herbes aromatiques. Elle entrevoit dans l'eau, sur ses bras nus et sur son sein, les reflets des deux palmiers plantés à la naissance de son frère et à la sienne, qui entrelaçaient au-dessus de sa tête leurs rameaux verts et leurs jeunes cocos. Elle pense à l'amitié de Paul, plus douce que les parfums, plus pure que l'eau des fontaines, plus forte que les palmiers unis, et elle soupire. Elle songe à la nuit, à la solitude, et un feu dévorant la saisit. Aussitôt elle sort, effrayée, de ces dangereux ombrages, et de ces eaux plus brûlantes que les soleils de la zone torride. Elle court auprès de sa mère chercher un appui contre elle-même. Plusieurs fois,

voulant lui raconter ses peines, elle lui pressa les mains les siennes; plusieurs fois elle fut près de prononcer le nom de Paul, mais son cœur oppressé laissa sa langue sans expression; et, posant sa tête sur le sein maternel, elle ne put que pleurer [pp. 72-3].

As I have pointed out elsewhere,[2] this episode was probably suggested to Saint-Pierre by Saint-Foix, who in the *Histoire de Félime et Abderamen* describes a similar situation. But in *Paul et Virginie* it is utterly transfigured. For Saint-Pierre is not merely superior to Saint-Foix as an artist; he had also the advantage of first-hand knowledge of the site he depicts.

The tempest at last breaks, to be followed by a period of calm. This is echoed in the decision of the two mothers to marry Paul to Virginie. Paul's future is discussed, and, like a good physiocrat, he chooses agriculture rather than commerce. Besides, he can see no reason for leaving his family to seek an illusory fortune in a foreign land. Meanwhile, however, the happiness of the little group is threatened by a letter from Virginie's wealthy aunt in France, inviting her niece to visit her. The girl is now to become an heiress. As the novelist suggests by this incident, it is impossible to escape from civilization, which now marches across the Atlantic and invades this little sanctuary, with direful results. But we are reminded at this point that even in eighteenth-century Mauritius our small group is not entirely living in a state of nature. That becomes evident when the governor, abetted by his chaplain, urges Mme de la Tour to send her daughter away for two years. Virginie, impressed by the arguments of her confessor, who tells her that it is the will of God, offers no more resistance. Saint-Pierre, on the other hand, insinuates that there are

[2] *Modern Language Review*, XX, no. 1, 1925.

natural reasons which far outweigh those adduced by the representatives of the State and Church.

The first shadow now clouds the friendship of Mme de la Tour and Marguerite who, on learning that Virginie is likely to be wealthy, abruptly abandons her efforts to persuade the girl to stay. Paul sombrely watches the preparations. Saint-Pierre now portrays a dramatic situation which was quite without precedent in French literature. The son begs his mother to keep Virginie on the island: his mother, moved at the sight of his grief, has the courage to explain to him the new difference between Virginie and himself. She confesses her fault to Paul, who learns not only that he is the son of a woman of peasant stock but that he is illegitimate. When he finally understands what this means, it strengthens his love for Marguerite. Unfortunately, at the same time, the knowledge makes him misinterpret the cause of Virginie's unusual aloofness. Unaware that it is due to the timidity of a girl in love, he thinks that she now despises him because of his antecedents. Civilization has done its work and the harmony of the natural order is now shattered. However, Paul is resolved to have an explanation with Virginie.

The reconciliation scene is enacted in a setting of incredible beauty. We do not know, of course, till the end of the novel that this is the last conversation between Paul and Virginie; yet the whole of this nocturne is fraught with a spirit of elegy as if the lovers knew that these are the last words they will ever exchange.

In his mad sorrow, Paul upbraids his mother and Mme de la Tour with their cruelty, and Virginie's mother, yielding to her natural sensibility, cancels the whole scheme. But in the morning Virginie has gone. The governor and the priest, using their authority, and deaf

to the protests of Mme de la Tour, had hurried her daughter away just in time to catch the favourable tide. So when Paul looks out in the morning it is to see Virginie's ship already a speck on the horizon. Instinctively he knows that this is the end of their dream and, as if she were already dead, he piously treasures the last objects touched by his sweetheart.

At this stage the old man who narrates the story tells of his attempts to shake the boy out of his lethargy. Now eager to seize on the smallest link with Virginie, Paul accepts his offer to teach him, and in order to correspond with Virginie, he learns how to read and write. The old man who is the mouthpiece of the author, talks to Paul of the contemplative life, the pleasures of which he contrasts with the vanity of civilized existence. He speaks of the evils that breed unhappiness: inequality of rank, intolerance, the suppression of liberty, the subjection of women, the absence of true virtue. For virtue, in his sense, is "un effort fait sur nous-mêmes pour le bien d'autrui dans l'intention de plaire à Dieu seul." Saint-Pierre does not believe, like the *philosophes*, that virtue can be dissociated with conflict. As a result of this conversation, Paul suddenly realizes that Virginie, because of her virtue, is sacrificing her happiness in order to do good to others, and he is certain that from the same motive she will come back to Mauritius. A letter arrives describing her unhappiness in France. From rumours that reach the island, her aunt clearly intends to marry her to someone abroad. Paul, whose imagination has been spoiled now by the novels he has read, is filled with anxiety. Besides, he is now suddenly made aware of the passage of time. A tree which was only knee-high when Virginie left, has shot up to a height of twenty feet. Like Proust's Marcel, revisiting the *hôtel*

de Guermantes after the lapse of years, Paul becomes aware of time externalized for him in the papaver tree. "Les objets que nous voyons habituellement ne nous font pas percevoir de la rapidité de notre vie; ils vieillissent avec nous d'une vieillesse insensible: mais ce sont ceux que nous revoyons tout à coup, après les avoir perdus quelques années de vue, qui nous avertissent de la vitesse avec laquelle s'écoule le fleuve de nos jours" (p. 125).

One morning a ship is sighted, and Paul goes down to the pier to seek news of Virginie. The pilot goes out and comes back with the information that it is the *Saint-Géran*. There is a letter from Virginie, who is to disembark with the other passengers at dawn. But during the night the sea rises and the *Saint-Géran* is driven towards the shore. She sends up signals of distress. By morning the beach is crowded with people who can just distinguish through the fog the masts and rigging of a huge vessel. A hurricane is brewing. The leaves in the forest rustle though there is no wind; and the frigate-birds wheel inland for shelter. Now Saint-Pierre gives his readers the first description of a storm at sea ever written by a Frenchman. It has scarcely been excelled for its simplicity and realism. Before the eyes of the helpless watchers on the shore the great ship is inexorably pounded on the rocks. Paul makes desperate efforts to swim out to Virginie, who can be seen standing on the deck, her arms stretched out in supplication. The *Saint-Géran* breaks up and the crew and passengers take to the water on planks, masts, casks, or anything that will float. A naked sailor tries to persuade Virginie to strip off her clothes and throw herself into the sea to save her life. Such is her modesty that she refuses and is engulfed with the ship. They find her body washed up on the

beach. Paul dies of grief two days after her burial and is followed shortly to the grave by the two mothers.

To the modern mind, this *dénouement* is naïve and incredible because, fortunately, our notion of *la pudeur* has changed to such a degree as to make Virginie's scruples appear ridiculous. Yet one wonders whether our century is so completely devoid of prejudice as it imagines. Habit is a strange thing: none can judge of its power save in actual experience and by no exercise of rational speculation can the individual predict how he would behave in crises where the preservation of life depends upon the sudden abandonment of a life-long habit. In these days of nudist camps there are few who would be deterred from leaving a sinking ship from the fear of being seen naked. But can we honestly say that we would rather starve to death than overcome our horror of cannibalism? Would we face a firing squad rather than betray a friend, our country, or our religion? There is nothing absurd in Virginie's action if we remember that modesty is for her the most important thing in the world. Her conception of modesty is no doubt mistaken, but it is not ridiculous: no one who gives up her life for a principle, however stupid it may seem, can ever be ridiculous. Death confers dignity on every act of renunciation. To Saint-Pierre and his public Virginie's end seemed perfectly natural and pathetic.

II

The shadow of Boileau's *Art poétique* lay across the eighteenth century. When Saint-Pierre composed his *Paul et Virginie* nature and art were still separated by that barrier called *le bon goût*. No doubt, however, Boileau's axiom, "Rien n'est beau que le vrai, le vrai seul est aimable," had been interpreted in a manner

which would have surprised and shocked its author. Nevertheless, the artist of 1787 who set out to imitate nature was careful always to submit his raw material to a judicious process of sifting and of purification. Art copied, not nature, but *la belle nature*, that is, nature selected and discreetly beautified. The aesthetic principle observed by the eighteenth century is essentially still valid, though successive schools have tried, and always will try, to break away from it. Realists, Naturalists, and their successors have all failed to convince us that art is nature or that the best art is that which most closely reproduces actuality. The answer to their doctrine is, that art, when it begins to reproduce actual reality, ceases to be art just as the painter ceases to be an artist when he discards his brush for a camera. It may be argued that there are artistic photographs; but in that case it is because the photographer has exercised the artist's privileges of choice and elimination—in a word, when he makes the camera lie with beautiful results.

Now Saint-Pierre was a thorough artist. And that fact, as it happens, we are for once in a position to demonstrate in a practical way by showing the actual process by which the raw material of the novelist's observation was transmuted into the finished artistic product. In 1768, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre set out on a voyage to Mauritius, the Ile de France of our novel. He resided there for six months, took careful note of the manners of its inhabitants both white and black, of its flora and fauna indigenous and acclimatized, its climate, history, and physical configuration. He explored the island most thoroughly, and on his return to France published, in 1773, a *Voyage à l'Isle de France* which, if read in conjunction with *Paul et Virginie*, offers an illuminating example of how art differs from reality.

In the first place, we must not assume that Saint-Pierre went to Mauritius with any illusions that he was going to discover a life resembling that enjoyed by man in the golden age. From the closing remarks of the *Voyage*, it is clear that his observations of nature in remote parts of Europe had already convinced him that there never was a time when man, not organized in society, could live the carefree existence pictured by Rousseau in his *Discours sur les origines de l'inégalité*. And what he saw in Mauritius simply confirmed what he had already observed. "We are assured," writes Saint-Pierre, " . . . that in the golden age of the Gauls, our ancestors used to live on acorns. But the acorn of our oak-tree is constipating. Only that of the green oak can be digested, and it is very rare in France and is very common in Italy whence the tradition has come down to us. A little natural history might be useful in writing the history of humanity." Six months in Mauritius and a visit to the Cape taught him that "if most travellers in interpreting nature sin through lack of vocabulary, they also sin through excess of conjecture." And above all, they commit the unpardonable sin of placing happiness always outside their own country. "They give us such agreeable descriptions of foreign lands that all our lives we are out of humour with our own." On returning from his travels, Saint-Pierre after faithfully narrating his experiences, concluded thus:

Je préférerais de toutes les campagnes celle de mon pays, non parce qu'elle est belle mais parce que j'y ai été élevé. Il est dans le lieu natal un attrait caché, je ne sais quoi d'attendrissant, qu' aucune fortune ne saurait donner, et qu'aucun pays ne peut rendre. Où sont ces jeux du premier âge, ces jours si pleins sans prévoyance et sans amertume? La prise d'un oiseau me comblait de joie. Que j'avais de plaisir à caresser une perdrix, à recevoir ses coups de bec, à sentir dans mes mains palpiter son cœur et frissonner ses

plumes! Heureux qui revoit les lieux où tout fut aimé, où tout parut aimable, et la prairie où il courut, et le verger qu'il ravagea! Plus heureux qui ne vous a jamais quitté, toit paternel, asyle saint! Que de voyageurs reviennent sans trouver de retraite! De leurs amis, les uns sonts morts, les autres éloignés; une famille est dispersée. . . . Mais la vie n'est qu'un petit voyage et l'âge de l'homme un jour rapide.[3]

Yet during the years between his return from Mauritius and the composition of *Paul et Virginie*, Saint-Pierre's attitude to the island was to undergo a sea change. Subjected to the play of the artist's imagination, the scenes which he described in the *Voyage* insensibly shed their original ugliness and brutality. Reality, viewed in this perspective, and transformed by the author's new belief in a universe created by God expressly for the benefit of mankind, gradually acquired the contours of the land presented to us in *Paul et Virginie*. The true artist has no conscience in regard to literal truth; for it is so easy to persuade himself, like Saint-Pierre, that in deliberately tampering with the actual he is merely sacrificing inessential minor accuracies to a conception of the real which is more profoundly true and infinitely more beautiful. Therefore, only fools and pedants exclaim against the immorality of this procedure. Art, after all, is not nature: it is the power which creates a gorgeous illusion about nature and reconciles us to the vision of nature which is seen by the eyes of reason. So the *Voyage à l'Isle de France* remains a mere book of travel whilst *Paul et Virginie* is a masterpiece. But Saint-Pierre the artist is already to be discerned in the *Voyage*. He regarded it as his *coup d'essai* in the art of literature while not forgetting that, as a traveller, it was his business to observe, to report, and to inform. "On

[3] *Voyage à l'Isle de France*, Neuchâtel, 1773, I, pp. 157-8.

dit qu'un saint commença avec un moellon un bâtiment qui est devenu une magnifique abbaye. Il fit ce miracle avec le temps et la patience." Saint-Pierre, alas! never achieved his magnificent abbey, but in *Paul et Virginie* he built an exquisite little chapel where many thousands found spiritual solace.

The voyage from L'Orient to Mauritius took four months and thirteen days. Saint-Pierre did it in the *Marquis de Castries*, a hundred-and-thirty-foot schooner with a crew of one hundred and forty-six and a cargo of spars for Bengal. By day and night our traveller watched the changing pageant of the sea and sky which he describes in language that marks a date in the evolution of French style. In passing through the Straits of Mozambique, the *Marquis de Castries* ran into a tempest and was struck by a thunderbolt which stunned two officers and smashed the mainmast. In three pages of nervous and excited prose Saint-Pierre tells of a catastrophe which was later to be embodied, with various alterations, in *Paul et Virginie*. One has only to compare the two versions to realize why the agony of the *Saint-Géran* is vividly imprinted on our memory. Shorn of inessentials, condensed and enhanced by the artist's genius, the storm of fiction has the air of being more real than the reality. That is the test of art.

Sadly battered, with sixty sick of scurvy and a death-roll of eleven, the *Marquis de Castries* lurched into the harbour of Port-Louis, where the novelist got his first impression of the island. The town is situated at the opening of a valley,

> formé en cul de sac par une chaîne de hautes montagnes hérissées de rochers sans arbres et sans buissons. Les flancs de ces montagnes sont couverts pendant six mois de l'année d'une herbe brûlée, ce qui rend tout ce paysage noir comme une charbonnière. Le couronnement des mornes qui forment ce triste vallon est brisé. La

partie la plus élevée se trouve à son extrémité et se termine par un rocher isolé qu'on appelle le Pouce. Cette partie contient encore quelques arbres; il en sort un ruisseau qui traverse la ville et dont l'eau n'est pas bonne à boire.

So much for reality. Turn now to the passage in *Paul et Virginie* where reality is transposed in terms of art:

A l'entrée de ce bassin d'où l'on découvre tant d'objets, les échos de la montagne répètent sans cesse le bruit des vents qui agitent les forêts voisines et le fracas des vagues qui se brisent au loin sur les récifs; mais, au pied même des cabanes, on n'entend plus aucun bruit, et on ne voit autour de soi que de grands rochers escarpés comme des murailles. Des bouquets d'arbres croissent à leurs bases, dans leurs fentes, et jusque sur leurs cimes, où s'arrêtent les nuages. Les pluies que leurs pitons attirent peignent souvent les couleurs de l'arc-en-ciel sur leurs flancs verts et bruns, et entretiennent à leur pied les sources dont se forme la petite rivière des Lataniers. Un grand silence règne dans leur enceinte, où tout est paisible, l'air, les eaux et la lumière. A peine l'écho y répète le murmure des palmistes qui croissent sur leurs plateaux élevés, et dont on voit les longues flèches toujours balancées par les vents. Un jour doux éclaire le fond de ce bassin, où le soleil ne luit qu'à midi; mais dès l'aurore ses rayons en frappent le couronnement, dont les pics, s'élevant au-dessus des ombres de la montagne, paraissent d'or et de pourpre sur l'azur des cieux.

The traveller speaks of the native flora and fauna almost in tones of physical revulsion. The flowers are sparse and drab, and the trees mostly of soft wood emitting an evil odour. There is, however, an aloe, "portant une fleur jaune marbrée de rouge," which in the novel serves as a prelude to the following charming passage: "Diverses espèces d'aloès, la raquette chargée de fleurs jaunes fouettées de rouge, les cierges épineux, s'élevaient sur les têtes noires des rochers et semblaient vouloir atteindre aux longues lianes, chargées de fleurs bleues ou écarlates, qui pendaient çà et là le long des escarpements de la montagne."[4]

[4] *Paul et Virginie*, p. 43.

At almost every page in the novel there are traces of the same subtle alchemy. A word, a line, a fact is slightly altered, omitted, or elaborated in view of the mass impression by the artist. One of the passages in *Paul et Virginie* which enchanted his contemporaries by the exotic charm of its strange-sounding names is that where the author describes the trees planted by Paul in their little domain, "badamiers, manguiers, avocats, goyaviers, jacqs et jamroses." But in the *Voyage* we learn that the fruit of the "goyavier" has *une odeur de punaise* whilst the "jamrose," though it has the "odeur d'un bouton de rose, est d'un goût un peu sucré et insipide" and the "jacq" produces a monstrous fruit, "qui a une odeur empestée de fromage pourri." Nor in *Paul et Virginie* do we hear of the swarms of rats, mice, locusts, ants, tarantulas, ticks, and other loathsome, crawly things which make life on Mauritius so horrible.

During his stay on the island Saint-Pierre did not exactly discover a Paul or a Virginie: most of the white inhabitants, indeed, revolted him by their brutal treatment of their slaves. Yet there is one incident which might conceivably have suggested the idyll presented in the novel. On his journey round the island he came at nightfall to a plantation inhabited by a Frenchman and his wife, called Lenormand. Here they lived with their five children, a young relative and a friend of the husband's, together with the usual retainers. Yet there is nothing romantic about his first impression:

Je ne vis dans toute la maison qu'une seule pièce; au milieu, la cuisine; à une extrémité, les magasins et les logements des domestiques; à l'autre bout, le lit conjugal, couvert d'une toile sur laquelle une poule couvait ses œufs, sous le lit des canards, des pigeons sous la feuillée et trois gros chiens à la porte. . . . La nuit venue, on servit avec propreté tout ce que l'habitation fournissait. Ce souper me parut fort agréable. Je ne pouvais me lasser de voir

ces pigeons voler autour de la table, ces chèvres qui jouaient avec les enfants et tant d'animaux réunis autour de cette famille charmante. Leurs jeux paisibles, la solitude du lieu, le bruit de la mer, me donnaient une image de ces premiers temps où les filles de Noé, descendues sur une terre nouvelle, firent encore part aux espèces douces et familières du toit de la table et du lit.[5]

This charming memory, contrasting so sharply with his experiences of the discontented society at Port-Louis, was destined to become years later a fertile source of inspiration for the artist. In thinking of the Lenormands, Saint-Pierre conceived the idea of the perfect family composed of his two lovers and their mothers. Because he was a poet he thrust out of his mind all the truths about Mauritius which it is hard for an artist to render *aimable*—to use Boileau's adjective: the mutilated slaves, the grasping, ruthless traders, the ravages wrought by disease, the endless battle with climate, and the eternal nostalgia which he himself expressed so poignantly at the close of his *Voyage*.

[5] *Voyage*, I, pp. 198-9.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

P. E. Corbett

Of the seven Great Powers in the world to-day, only four appear to be working in accordance with a settled plan of foreign policy. Great Britain, France, and Russia are living from hand to mouth, their conduct determined by the day's expediency. Their policy is peace, if you will, but it is the perilous peace of the moment, preserved by retreat and by shifting alliances, methods which increase the danger of ultimate explosion. Peace until we are ready to fight, would perhaps not be an unjust description. Of the remaining Powers, Italy, Japan, and Germany have the same plan, which is progressive aggrandizement at whatever cost of violence and illegality. The United States alone has thought out and is following a long-term plan of peace and good neighbourhood. Hers, that is to say, is the one government of the first rank which at present shows any sense of ethical and legal progress towards an effective world-community.

This positive and constructive pacifism is a new thing at Washington, but its reality is attested by a succession of events which are irrebuttable evidence. In Canada all but the most spectacular of the events passed unperceived, and we accordingly failed to note the general trend. It is safe to say that the majority of Canadians, remembering, however vaguely, something about Cuba, Panama, Haiti, and Nicaragua, greeted with scepticism the slogan of "the good neighbour." "Tell that to your marines", was probably the prevailing attitude.

Now the point is that it has been told to the marines, and the reorientation of American foreign policy must surely rank among the major achievements of our time.

It is important for the world; it has special importance for Canada. Its significance can be best understood if we study it against a background of those inherited doctrines and traditions, streaked by cross-currents of imperialism, which until quite recently determined the external conduct of the United States.

I

The main directives of American foreign policy in the nineteenth century are as familiar as the names of George Washington and James Monroe. The first hallowed in his farewell address the common desire of the American people to be free of the wars and the diplomatic intrigues of Europe; the second, for the better preservation of that hard-earned immunity, issued the famous warning of 1823 that the United States would regard any attempt on the part of European Powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety," and that the American continents were not to be considered "subjects for future colonization by any European Power."

Complete passivity was far too high a price, however, for Americans to pay for the privilege of exemption. To many of them personally, to all of them as a nation needing revenue with which to build, it was vitally important that trade should not be interrupted by the endemic wars of the countries buying their commodities. From the first, therefore, they championed the legal rights of the neutral. Against Britain and against France they fulminated impartially in diplomatic protest over increasingly drastic interference with merchant vessels. "Freedom of the seas" became an article of faith. In 1798 the country was in a state of partial war with its late ally because of the depredations of French

cruisers; and in 1812 British captures and confiscations, coupled with the impressment of sailors on American ships, served as the pretext, if they were not the reason for war with England.

If they insisted on freedom of maritime trade, subject only to the recognized limitations of contraband and blockade, successive American governments were prepared, on the other hand, to enforce within their jurisdiction the *duties* of neutrality. From 1792 on, they set themselves resolutely against the use of American territory as a base of operations or a source of man-power for any belligerent. In spite of a treaty of 1778 with France which gave Citizen Genêt, French minister to the United States, some colour of justification for his acts, Jefferson put an emphatic stop to the recruiting of men, and the commissioning and equipping of French corsairs in American waters, for use against British shipping. This assertion of impartiality was followed by the Neutrality Act of 1794, which, in addition to prohibiting the fitting out of vessels and the organizing in the territory of the United States of expeditions by one belligerent against another, rendered illegal enlistment or procuring enlistment in the armed forces of a foreign state at war. It was in pursuit of the same policy that Crampton, British minister at Washington, was dismissed in 1856 because, during the Crimean War, he had arranged for the recruitment of residents of the United States. And, having enforced such principles in behalf of other countries at war, the United States was in an unassailable moral position to insist on their observance by others when she herself was belligerent. In 1871 she successfully vindicated her version of the duties of a neutral in one of history's most famous arbitrations, and was awarded

heavy damages for the depredations of the *Alabama* and other Confederate vessels fitted out in British ports.

The United States did not cease to assert the trading rights of the neutral up to, and for some years after, the Great War. Her struggle against the severe and ubiquitous restrictions which Great Britain imposed upon commerce with Germany is a familiar memory. Only the cruelties of Germany's retaliatory submarine warfare and a fundamental sympathy with the Allied cause prevented her from resorting to force to protect neutral shipping. "Freedom of the seas" takes prominent place among the fourteen points upon which President Wilson sought to establish the peace of 1919, and was probably the underlying reason why the Geneva Conference of 1927 failed so dismally to limit cruiser-tonnage, and threatened instead to precipitate an Anglo-American naval race. Finally, the fear that the United States would insist upon the right of her citizens to carry supplies to the culprit has been a constant deterrent in the whole post-War movement to organize collective sanctions against aggressor nations.

American governments have been similarly consistent in maintaining that impartiality which becomes the neutral. The principles which the United States had asserted achieved general acceptance in the Hague Conventions of 1907, and now form part of the law of nations. Before the country entered the War in 1917, its courts had been busy enforcing the neutrality laws against both sides, and President Wilson's administration had dismissed the Austrian ambassador and two members of the German embassy for flagrant violations of those statutes.

As for the Monroe Doctrine, we find not only that it was firmly supported, but that, in the course of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth,

various corollaries accrued to it, making it an instrument of imperialistic control, particularly in the Caribbean and in Central America. When the termination of the Civil War freed the federal government from exclusively domestic preoccupations, the original doctrine was invoked to oust Maximilian from Mexico. In 1895, President Cleveland added a new element to it when he threatened war if Great Britain should not consent to arbitrate her dispute with Venezuela over the boundary of British Guiana. The addition was vigorously confirmed by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1902 when, by the argument *ad baculum*, he induced England, Germany, and Italy to abandon their joint blockade of Venezuela and to arbitrate the financial claims of their subjects against that embarrassed country. When a similar situation presented itself in Santo Domingo, the same president not only forbade European intervention but installed a financial administration, coupled with a military occupation which was not terminated until 1924.

This development sprang directly from the increasing investment of American capital in Latin America. This was the period of "dollar diplomacy;" and orderly government and the protection of business enterprise in the Caribbean and Central American republics were matters of growing concern to powerful interests in the United States. A plausible argument for intervention was that since the Monroe Doctrine precluded the European Powers from affording naval or military protection to foreigners engaged in developing the resources of these countries, it implied a corresponding obligation on the part of the United States to assume the police function when native administrations failed.

In 1903 came an event which has always been a principal item in the case against Yankee imperialism.

The Colombian Senate, by refusing to ratify the Hay-Herran Treaty, threatened to frustrate the long-laid plan for a canal through the Isthmus of Panama. The United States, taking advantage, with suspicious haste, of a local revolt, recognized the new Republic of Panama, and within a month had concluded with it the Hay-Varilla Treaty under which she obtained the perpetual use, occupation, and control of a ten-mile strip of territory for the construction and maintenance of the proposed canal. Other clauses of the agreement guaranteed the independence of Panama and made of that country a virtual protectorate of the United States.

Two years earlier, Cuba had been placed in much the same position. The Spanish-American War had put an end to the sovereignty of Spain in that island; and under the Platt Amendment Cuba had submitted to an arrangement which gave the United States the right to "intervene for the protection of Cuban independence [and] the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property and individual liberty. . . ."

Occupation for the protection of financial interests, inaugurated in Santo Domingo in 1905, was extended between 1908 and 1915 to Nicaragua and to Haiti. To complete the picture of American dominance in these regions, we have only to add that, as a further result of the war with Spain, Porto Rico had become a colony of the United States. Throughout the period of intervention and acquisition the invocation of the Monroe Doctrine as the basic principle of American penetration transformed what had originally been a welcome safeguard of autonomous development into an object of common fear, jealousy, and detestation among the Latin peoples of the new world.

In the Far East, where her interests began in the

1840's to assume considerable importance, the United States has not shown quite the same consistent distaste for entanglements with European Powers. The remoteness of the area probably made her less sensitive; in any case her policy there has fluctuated between aloof but energetic independence and co-operation. The general object of that policy has found expression in the maxim of "the open door," meaning opportunities for Americans to share equally in China's trade and the same rights of extra-territoriality as those accorded to Europeans. This was the substance of the commercial treaty concluded with China in 1844. But in regard to Japan the United States took the initiative in imposing intercourse and commerce, and would have established a strong territorial foothold in the Orient in the decade preceding the Civil War had it not been for Democratic opposition. Commodore Perry's occupation of the Bonin Islands was abandoned, and Dr. Parker's plan for annexing Formosa was not carried out. These imperialist designs were not effectively resumed until 1898, when Hawaii and the Philippines were appropriated. In the meantime, the Washington government had more than once taken a hand with Great Britain or France in forcing the Japanese or the Chinese to submit to the blessings of commercial and cultural intercourse with the West, and in punishing them for explosions of hostility to traders or missionaries. Samoa was another centre of Pacific interest, and there the United States, after seventeen years of flirtation with native princelings in hope of commercial advantages and a naval base, joined in 1889 with the competing suitors, England and Germany, to establish a tripartite protectorate.

The Boxer Rebellion was an important occasion of joint action; and in the military measures which imposed

the Allied terms of compensation, the United States took an active part. But, never having competed in the scramble for territorial concessions in China, she took advantage of the negotiations to call for a halt in the dismemberment of the Celestial Empire. John Hay, secretary of state, in a note to the other governments concerned, used a phrase, "preserve Chinese territorial and administrative entity," which was later to be formally adopted as an expression of the common intent of the Great Powers, and to be made a mockery by Japanese aggression.

The most vigorous protagonist of the "open door," and opponent of foreign territorial domination in China, was President Theodore Roosevelt. In 1904 he was apparently prepared to go to the length of military aid to Japan if France and Germany should support Russia in her drive on Manchuria. Afterwards, when his mediation had brought the Russo-Japanese War to an end, and the late combatants, supported respectively by France and England, set about partitioning Manchuria into spheres of exclusive influence, it was with Germany that the peacemaker joined in vindicating the principle of equal commercial opportunity. These experiences taught him the interdependence of European and Asiatic affairs, and by 1907 we find him and Elihu Root, his secretary of state, leading the movement at the second Hague Conference to transform the panel of arbitrators, set up in 1899, into a real court of international justice. Though supported by England and by Germany, he failed because no method of manning such a court, satisfactory to both great nations and small, could then be devised.

With the entry of the United States into the Great War and her active participation in determining the

conditions of peace and setting up the structure of a League of Nations, it seemed as if a new era of unrestricted co-operation had set in. The Republican opposition was able, however, to mobilize against President Wilson the whole weight of traditional antipathy to "entangling alliances," and official American policy reverted to its habit of aloof superiority *vis-à-vis* a Europe seething with problems raised by the War and the Peace.

For the betterment of social and sanitary conditions, the control of the traffic in arms and in drugs, and even for the reduction of armaments, the United States was willing to negotiate at Geneva; but she would have no part in any fixed organization for the peace of the world. Turning her back on her own initiative of 1907, she rejected all efforts to lure her into the Permanent Court of International Justice. It was only in the Orient, where co-operation had become less strange to her, that she consented to join in a political arrangement for the prevention of war. Even there she avoided any obligation to positive action. The Nine-Power Treaty of 1921, with its promises to respect the territorial sovereignty and administrative integrity of China, contains no undertaking to see that these promises are kept. Here, as in the Four-Power Treaty where the United States, Great Britain, France, and Japan agree not to disturb the *status quo* in reference to their insular possessions in the Pacific, the sole positive obligation is to confer and communicate in the event of dispute.

The same caution marked what was hailed, in 1928, as the return of the United States to the central arena of world politics. The Pact of Paris, which purports to outlaw war and records the agreement of the parties never to seek by other than peaceful means the solution of their disputes, sets up no mechanism for dealing with

controversies. President Roosevelt has followed President Hoover in declaring the United States willing to take counsel with other nations when the Pact is broken; but that is the utmost commitment accepted by the Washington government.

II

If we leave the story of American foreign policy in 1930 and return to it at the end of 1937, we find both style and matter altered almost beyond recognition. Turning back over the intervening period to discover by what steps the transformation has come about, we shall be startled by the series of Joint Resolutions constituting Acts of Congress dated August 31, 1935, February 29, 1936, and April 29, 1937, on the subject of neutrality. These Acts, which give the president the power, and impose on him the duty, to prohibit the export of arms and other articles to belligerents, are a crescendo of restrictions on the liberties which international law would recognize in American traders as citizens of a neutral state. They go, that is to say, far beyond any obligation of restraint upon supply which the existing international law of neutrality imposes. As the latest of them is in the main an enlarged edition of the other two, we may confine our analysis to it.

Under the Joint Resolution of April 29, 1937, the president is bound, whenever he finds that a state of war exists between foreign countries, to issue a proclamation stating that fact, and the export of arms and munitions to any state named in the proclamation thereupon becomes unlawful. He must make a similar proclamation, with the same effect, whenever he finds that there is in any foreign country such a condition of civil strife that

the supply of arms and munitions would endanger the peace of the United States.

The president has the same power and duty in regard to any other articles when he finds that restrictions on their shipment are necessary "to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens." And if for the same reasons he judges it expedient so to do, he must stop the export of *all goods whatsoever* which have not been purchased outright by the foreign consignee before shipment. This "cash and carry" clause is designed to terminate all interest of American citizens before the goods become exposed to capture and confiscation, and thus to avoid disputes over neutral rights between the American government and belligerent Powers. It would be likely to operate to the enormous advantage of a belligerent having liquid resources in the United States, and is therefore open to the criticism that, while in form impartial, it would in fact be incompatible with any substantial neutrality.

The same criticism is levelled at another clause in the Act, which is of considerable importance to Canada. The president may prescribe exception to these restrictions for the benefit of goods, other than arms and munitions, transported on lakes, rivers, and inland waters or over land bordering on the United States. One object of this provision would appear to be to prevent dislocation of the trade with Canada. The immense interest of the American manufacturer in preserving that trade for ordinary peaceful purposes is self-evident; but the fact can scarcely have escaped notice that the Dominion may find itself used as an *entrepôt* in the supply of commodities to warring states.

The Act further makes it unlawful to sell or purchase securities of any state or faction named in the president's

proclamation, or to make loans or extend credit to the same. Finally, American citizens are forbidden to travel on the ships of any state so named.

It must be borne constantly in mind that all of these prohibitions are the result, not of treaty or any customary rule of the law of nations, but of congressional legislation. They do not, therefore, constitute a waiver of any rights claimed by the United States under international law, and as far as that law is concerned it will still be open to the American government to assert the trading rights of the neutral with all the vigour that it devoted to that cause in the early years of the Great War.

In practice, however, it will be impossible for Washington to take any such course. The whole purpose of the legislation is to avoid being drawn into war either by the acts of citizens supplying one belligerent to the detriment of another, or by quarrels arising out of the official protection of such citizens. The people of the United States have been led, partly by their abhorrence of war and partly by the revelation of the unscrupulous machinations and inordinate gains of arms-manufacturers and war-financiers, not merely to forgo, but to put a ban upon, the profits of neutrality. They were warned by such writers as Walter Lippmann and such jurists as Professors Borchard and John Bassett Moore, that the proposed statutes might simply drive prospective belligerents to other sources of supply, thus precipitating economic depression in the United States without preventing war or appreciably diminishing the risk of ultimate implication. They have disregarded the warnings and chosen the path of embargo; and they cannot with any consistency permit their governments henceforward to champion the "freedom of the seas." Apart from the difficulty of diplomatically protecting citizens

in their breaking of the national law, the Act of 1937 contains the explicit provision that no losses by the owners of vessels carrying, or underwriters insuring, prohibited exports "shall be made a basis of any claim put forward by the government of the United States." Thus that government would have to break its own law, though not the law of nations, to adopt and prosecute such claims. In effect, therefore, the recent legislation is something quite different from an extension of the old policy of enforcing neutrality within American territory; it is substantially the abandonment of neutral rights.

After examining the drastic changes in the neutrality laws, we shall have to turn our attention to an expression which, since 1933, has been constantly recurring in official statements on international affairs. "The policy of the good neighbour" is a phrase first used by President Roosevelt, though the policy itself was inaugurated by his predecessor. It means the end of American imperialism. To some it means the end of the Monroe Doctrine; and if that is not the case, it at least involves the transformation of the doctrine from a proud declaration of unilateral intent into an agreed common directive of Pan-American policy.

Expressions of goodwill are an almost meaningless habit of diplomacy; but the United States has given meaning and substance to its declarations of neighbourliness. The American marines were withdrawn from Nicaragua, in January, 1933, before the end of the Hoover régime; President Roosevelt followed this initiative by withdrawing them also from Haiti. In 1934 a treaty was concluded with Cuba which abrogates the Platt Amendment and releases that republic from the limitations on its sovereignty imposed after the Spanish-American War. In March, 1936, was signed a treaty

with Panama, which terminates the partial suzerainty of the United States over that country. Going farther afield, Congress has enacted a law providing for the independence of the Philippines after a probationary period of ten years. It is true that these islands, besides being an exposed flank to Japan, had become an unwelcome competitor, within the tariff wall, to American producers of sugar and tobacco; none the less the abandonment of territory, annexed as a base of operations in the Far East, marks the end of acquisitive designs in that part of the world.

The change bore fruit in the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace held at Buenos Aires in December, 1936. The documentary product of that Conference is voluminous, consisting as it does of two treaties, one protocol, eight conventions, and sixty-two resolutions or recommendations. To a considerable extent, these instruments are re-affirmations or extensions of principles laid down at earlier conferences of the Pan-American Union, from that of Santiago in 1923 to that of Montevideo ten years later. There are, however, many new elements, the most significant being the numerous provisions for consultation with a view to common action, and the protocol against intervention. It is to these that politicians and journalists refer when they speak of the abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine.

The first and most important convention produced by the Conference begins with an article which can be properly appreciated only by reference to the Brazilian draft. As there worded, the text was explicitly aimed at aggression by non-American states and amounted to a Pan-Americanization of the Monroe Doctrine. In less challenging terms, that is the meaning of the revised text. Any threat to the peace of the American republics is

made a matter of concern to all of them, and they undertake to consult together with a view to maintaining their common security. Similar consultation is agreed to in the event of war between American states or of international war outside America which might endanger the peace of the Americas.

Attached to this first Convention is the "Protocol Relative to Non-Intervention." The high contracting parties "declare inadmissible the intervention of any one of them, directly or indirectly, and for whatever reason, in the internal or external affairs of any other of the parties." This brief Article is the formal repudiation by the United States of that hated rider to the Monroe Doctrine which served to justify the assumption of financial and police powers in various Latin-American states. With the preceding Convention, the Protocol is widely regarded in South and Central America as consecrating a new era of friendly and confident collaboration with the "Colossus of the North."

It would be wrong, of course, to convey the impression that all is brotherhood and love in the southern half of this hemisphere. We know that Paraguay and Bolivia left the family gathering without having reached a settlement of the dispute over the Chaco. We also know that Argentina has many reservations to any programme of effective Pan-Americanism. She presents these hesitations in the guise of her duty to the League of Nations, displaying an astounding affection for an organization which, after thirteen years of dithering, she formally joined only in 1933. Her real motive is probably the ambition to wield predominant influence in South America, whereas Pan-Americanism seems to offer at best the position of second fiddle to the United States. President Roosevelt and his long-suffering secretary of

state have spared neither patience nor concession to win the Argentine Republic and its enterprising foreign minister, Dr. Saavedra Lamas; but nationalism is strong in Buenos Aires, and in the hymn of friendship the voice of Argentina was not of the heartiest.

In connection with the Buenos Aires Conference there has come a marked revival of the movement to draw Canada into the Pan-American Union. This time, according to respectable report, the delegation from Washington was only deterred by the scruples of the Canadian prime minister from moving the Dominion's admission. Press notices, articles, and discussion on both sides of the border attest a greater interest than has ever previously existed in the possibility of Canadian membership. Such opposition as there has been in the Union itself has come from certain Latin-Americans who feared that Canada at the conferences might be a catspaw of an imperialistic United States. With the laying of that spectre, there is every prospect that an official invitation would meet with unanimous support, given the assurance that Canada herself would welcome the proposal. The principal objections in this country have been the fear that membership would swing us finally out of the orbit of Great Britain, and into that of the United States, and the belief that the Union existed only on paper and would be unlikely to make any practical achievement. These objections are on the wane, because the attraction of Great Britain's orbit is diminishing while the Union of American Republics has, in spite of discordant notes, shown unmistakable signs of becoming a useful and productive institution in the social and political life of the two continents.

III

When we leave the politics of the western hemisphere and enter the field of general organization for the conduct of international affairs, we find no such concrete marks of change in the American attitude. All that we can clearly detect in this domain is a change of tone, which may be the forerunner of a change of practice. A battle still rages between those Americans who would keep their country insulated against European politics and those who believe that peace in Europe is the condition of peace for America as well. Hitherto the spectacular victories have been on the side of the isolationists, who in 1920 prevented the ratification of a Covenant for which President Wilson was largely responsible, and in 1935 secured rejection of the World Court. They have not, however, prevented participation in many of the non-political activities of Geneva; and the year which brought defeat to the Court Protocol brought membership in the International Labour Organization, which is constitutionally linked with the League of Nations. In 1931, moreover, a prominent feature of the unhappy Manchurian affair was the well-intentioned but ill-managed attempt of Mr. Stimson, secretary of state, to assist in the League's half-hearted endeavour to curb Japan. In Geneva there was lack of trust; at Washington, hesitation and unfamiliarity with League methods. Yet the memorandum of October 5, in which the Department of State promised to "reinforce what the League does," may well be remembered among the lost opportunities of history. The conduct of President Hoover's government on this occasion, coupled with that of the succeeding administration in the Abyssinian *débâcle*, is at least sufficient demonstration that the United States will not stand upon

neutral rights when economic sanctions are employed against an aggressor.

The last-minute refusal of the Senate to approve membership in the World Court has been attributed to the avowed intention of some of the forces pressing for ratification, to make this the first step towards full participation in the League of Nations. In the presidential campaign of 1936, the platform of the Republican party contained a plank to the effect that "America shall not become a member of the League of Nations nor of the World Court." It would be naïve to attribute any large part in the overwhelming defeat of Governor Landon to this expression of stern isolationism; but that defeat makes it probable that this item, along with some others, will disappear from future Republican programmes. Meantime there are other indications that the tide of popular, as well as official, feeling is turning towards more active association with other democracies in opposition to the ruthless megalomania which has inspired the invasion of China, Abyssinia, and Spain. President Roosevelt and Mr. Hull, his secretary of state, are giving a clear lead in that direction, and there is no reason to believe that by doing so they have forfeited their following. There is no isolationism in Mr. Hull's statement at a Convocation of the University of Toronto, on October 22, 1937, that "the maintenance of peace is the paramount need of mankind and a breach of the peace, wherever it occurs, is of vital concern to every nation." President Roosevelt was referring not only to China, but to Abyssinia and Spain as well, when he said at Chicago, on October 5, "The peace, the freedom and the security of ninety per cent. of the population of the world are being jeopardized by the remaining ten per cent., who are threatening a breakdown of all international order

and law. Surely the ninety per cent. who want to live in peace under law and in accordance with moral standards . . . can and must find some way to make their will prevail. . . . There must be positive endeavours to preserve peace."

These are the words of statesmen who believe, with reason, that they still have the support of a large majority of their countrymen. If they mean anything, they mean collaboration everywhere with those forces which are sincerely working to save civilization from brutal violence. They are the words of leaders who, in their series of trade agreements providing for the mutual lowering of tariff barriers, have proved their power to reverse a long-established trend in the economic policy of their country. They hold hope that a new consecration of the peace-loving peoples to the task of organizing the community of nations may not be doomed to futility by the cold absence of the world's most powerful republic.

MAGIC SPADES IN MESOPOTAMIA

THEOPHILE J. MEEK

THE past few years have been stirring ones in Mesopotamian archaeology. Never since George Smith's thrilling discovery of the Flood Story in 1872 have there been such startling finds, each year vying with the others in the importance of its discoveries. Never has there been such activity in the field, with all the important nations represented in the work. Numerous sites have been excavated in every part of the country, on a scale not attempted before and following a vastly more scientific technique, with careful attention given to stratification, pottery types, and the careful recording of all finds.[1] The result has been, not only an enlargement of our knowledge of the periods of Mesopotamian history concerning which we had some previous knowledge, but the opening up of a whole vista of pre-history absolutely undreamed of a few years ago, carrying us back to a date unbelievably remote, estimated to be at least as early as 5000 B.C.[2] It is the purpose of this paper to sketch the new picture of Mesopotamian history that has resulted from these discoveries, and it will deal with the several periods in chronological order.

[1]The modern technique is well set forth in two manuals: Badè, *A Manual of Excavation in the Near East*, 1934, and du Buisson, *La Technique des fouilles archéologiques*, 1934.

[2]Unfortunately there is no generally accepted system of chronology for Mesopotamian history, because there is no date that can be fixed with absolute certainty earlier than the ninth century B.C. Astronomers have attempted to determine certain early dates astronomically, but, working on exactly the same data, they have arrived at very different results, no two of them agreeing. An important tablet discovered by the University of Chicago expedition at Khorsabad some years ago would help to solve some of the problems, but unfortunately the tablet still remains unpublished. The dates given in this paper follow a short chronology and are considerably lower than those of many scholars. If they err in any respect, it is in being too conservative.

The Pre-dynastic Period, *c.* 5000 to *c.* 3000 B.C.

Until comparatively recent times practically nothing was known about the Pre-dynastic Period, beyond the meagre statements incorporated in their historical records by the Sumerians themselves. Then came the excavations at Tell Halaf in north-western Mesopotamia and at al-Ubaid, Uruk, and Jemdet Nasr in the south, each in turn revealing for the first time a distinct period of prehistoric culture, that can now be fitted into a sequence of four, each with its own several phases of development. Since it was at these sites that the several periods were first clearly attested, they have given their names to the periods and these are accordingly known in chronological order as the Tell Halaf, the al-Ubaid, the Uruk, and the Jemdet Nasr periods.

1. *The Tell Halaf Period.* Artifacts of Mousterian man have been discovered by Miss Garrod in caves near Sulaimaniya in central Mesopotamia, and some incised and monochrome burnished wares have been found on virgin soil at certain northern sites, such as Nineveh, Tepe Gawra, Arpachiya, Chagar Bazar, and Tell Halaf, which show affinities with the neolithic pottery of Syria and may in turn be neolithic. However, the oldest culture so far definitely attested in Mesopotamia, the Tell Halaf,[3] is clearly chalcolithic. From various indications we know that metal was used, but not very extensively. At Tepe Gawra a hoard of fluted gold beads was discovered, secreted in a pot, the earliest examples of worked metal known and the first evidence of value being placed on gold. In this period great skill was shown in the working of obsidian into knives, scrapers, beads, vases, and bowls; and the usual array of seals (stamp-

[3]The excavations at Tell Halaf itself are reported by von Oppenheim, *Der Tell Halaf*, 1931; also published in an English translation.

seals only), amulets, pendants, and beads, together with terra-cotta figurines and the like, appear in the excavations, while playing pipes in bone were found at Tepe Gawra.

The pottery of the Tell Halaf period was made by hand, is unbelievably thin, and shows an extraordinary grasp of shape and decorative effect in colour and design. The most characteristic shapes are shallow bowls decorated inside and out, deep bowls or craters with funnel-shaped necks, and bulging jars with relatively long necks. They were covered with a smooth cream or buff slip, on which were painted fine, elaborate designs usually in warm black or bright orange-red pigments, used both separately and conjointly to make monochrome and polychrome wares. The pottery was fired at great heat in closed kilns that permitted indirect firing with controlled temperatures. The result of the intense heat was the fusion and vitrification of the silicates in the paint, so that it became a genuine glaze that gave the surface a porcelain-like finish, quite different from the gloss of burnished ware so common later. Technically and artistically the Tell Halaf pottery is the finest hand-made ware of antiquity and bears witness to the high culture of its makers. The designs begin with naturalistic representations of animals, birds, and occasionally men,[4] and develop later into formally stylized patterns: geometric designs arranged in zones, with metopic composition within the zones. The patterns include chequers, lozenges, serial triangles, Maltese crosses, wheel patterns, scale patterns (intersecting circles and semicircles), stars, rosettes, double-axes, and bucrania (ox-heads seen full face).

[4]On a vase from Tell Halaf is what looks like the representation of a man and a chariot, the earliest known; best illustrated in Childe, *New Light on the Most Ancient East*, 1935, Pl. XXV, facing p. 256.

In the very earliest period the Tell Halaf people apparently lived in huts, but a little later building foundations appear, at first of *terre pisée* (beaten clay), but later of bricks, often with the lower courses of stone. Some of these are rectangular; but many are circular, and these buildings were apparently domed, with long covered approaches or vestibules. They have their nearest parallel in the well-known beehive tombs or "tholoi" in Mycenae and Crete, the circular building of Khirokitia in Cyprus,[5] and the circular structures belonging to the neolithic level of Jericho.[6] These analogues with the west, together with others like the double-axe and bucranium designs in the pottery, point to North Syria as the home of the Tell Halaf culture, one of the three great cultural provinces affecting Mesopotamia, but confined in its influence wholly to the north. At all northern sites, such as Tepe Gawra, Nineveh, Arpachiya, and Chagar Bazar,[7] evidences of this culture are numerous and run through several strata, but nothing at all appears further south, the few Tell Halaf sherds found at Samarra being clearly importations.

2. *The al-Ubaid Period.* The second great cultural province affecting Mesopotamia was the Iranian Highland. Its culture seems to have come down from the north, spreading eastward as far as Beluchistan and the Indus Valley[8] and westward through the whole of Meso-

[5]See Dikaios, *Illustrated London News*, Dec. 26, 1936, pp. 1171 *ff.*

[6]See Garstang, *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* (henceforth abbreviated *AAA.*), XXII, pp. 166 *ff.*

[7]The reports of the excavations at these sites are as follows: Speiser, *Excavations at Tepe Gawra*, I; *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (henceforth abbreviated *BASOR.*), nos. 65 and 66 (Tepe Gawra); Mallowan, *AAA.*, XX, pp. 127 *ff.* (Nineveh); Mallowan and Rose, *Iraq*, II, pp. 1 *ff.* (Arpachiya); Mallowan, *ibid.*, III, pp. 1 *ff.* (Chagar Bazar).

[8]Revealed by the archaeological surveys of Sir Aurel Stein; see, *e.g.*, *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, nos. 37 and 43: *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, LXIV, pp. 179 *ff.*; *Iraq*, III, pp. 111 *ff.* See also

potamia. Its first evidences are at Samarra,[9] and points further north, and a little later they appear in the south, particularly at al-Ubaid, by which name the culture is known in Mesopotamia. This highland culture was first revealed by the French excavations at Susa,[10] where Susa Ia seems to stand in a parental relationship to Samarra and al-Ubaid, Susa Ib being the counterpart of the latter. That the Samarra ware is somewhat earlier than the al-Ubaid is shown by the fact that it appears along with the Tell Halaf pottery at Chagar Bazar while the al-Ubaid appears later. The Iranian Highland culture was apparently more or less contemporaneous with the North Syrian, but the latter may have been a bit earlier. In any case northern Mesopotamia was settled considerably earlier than the south, which is wholly alluvial soil. In paleolithic times the head of the Persian Gulf extended to a point some distance north of modern Baghdad and it was only in the al-Ubaid period that the marshes were sufficiently dried up and drained to permit settlement in the south. The earliest habitations were reed huts, plastered with mud, the walls being composed of projecting reed-bundles alternated with recessed panels of reed-matting, the whole drawn together at the top to make the roof arched or domed. Thus originated the buttressed wall with shallow recesses, along with the vault and arch, that are so characteristic of later Sumerian architecture. Quite early in the period mud-brick makes its appearance, but there are no structures in the south to compare with those of an even earlier date in the

Marshall and Mackay, *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization*, 3 vols., 1931; summarized in Mackay, *The Indus Civilization*, 1935.

[9]The excavations were reported by Herzfeld, *Ausgrabungen von Samarra*, 1930.

[10]Published in the several volumes of the *Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse*. The most recent and most accurate stratification of the mound is found in volume XX, by de Mecquenem; *cf.* also his article in *Antiquity*, V, pp. 330 *ff.*

north—at Tepe Gawra, for example, where a temple complex of imposing size and grandeur has been unearthed.[11]

The al-Ubaid pottery is painted as is the Tell Halaf, but it is quite different and represents an entirely different culture. It is a very fine, pale greenish ware, handmade or turned on a slow wheel, with walls often very thin, and well fired. The characteristic shapes are tumblers, shallow dishes, chalices, squat pots with lugs on the shoulders, and a predominance of spouted jars so characteristic of later Sumerian ceramics. The designs are mostly in a free geometric style, painted with a soft brush in black or dark brown, usually lustrous, but sometimes matt.

The men seem to have dressed in sheepskin garments; they wore long beards, with the upper lip shaved, and had their hair tied back in a bun. They used boats with high prows and sterns, like the modern bellums. They tilled the earth with hoes of flaked chert, and reaped their grain with sickles of clay or wood, set with serrated flakes of flint. They brought bitumen from Hit on the middle Euphrates and imported obsidian from Armenia and copper from Elam. They hunted their prey with pear-shaped stone maces and invented the shaft-hole axe, both typically Sumerian. In fact the germs of so many of the distinctive features of Sumerian culture are found in this early period that Frankfort would seem to be right in making the al-Ubaid people the original stock out of which the Sumerians in course of time developed.[12]

It was between al-Ubaid I and II, at Ur, that the so-called "Flood level" was encountered, widely heralded as evidence for the historicity of the Flood story. How-

[11]See Speiser, *BASOR.*, no. 66, pp. 2 *ff.*
[12]See his *Archaeology and the Sumerian Question*, 1932.

ever, this flood level was not discovered in other parts of Ur, nor in the neighbouring mounds of al-Ubaid and Uruk. Hence the particular flood in question covered only the lowlands; and when it subsided, the excavations show, the al-Ubaid people returned and rebuilt their houses on the silt. At Kish and Shuruppak there are evidences of a flood toward the end of the Jemdet Nasr period, but again there is no evidence that these floods were anything more than local inundations continuing for a longer time than usual.

3. *The Uruk Period.* The third cultural province to bring its influence to bear on Mesopotamia was the Anatolian-Transcaucasian province, the home apparently of the Uruk culture. The pottery of this period consists of a gray ware covered with a highly polished slip, made very black by firing with dampish fuels and a smoky fire; a second, somewhat later ware, brick-red in colour, but plum-red in the higher strata, made from ferruginous clay, covered with a slip rich in iron oxides, which accounts for the colour; and a third ware like the second, but fired in a reducing temperature so as to produce a gray colour. Unlike the al-Ubaid, this ware was never painted; it was made with a slip, highly polished, and most of it was produced on a genuine spinning wheel, but the al-Ubaid survives more or less throughout the period, showing that the Uruk people constituted a minority in the population.

Another characteristic of the Uruk period was the use of the ziggurat or temple-mount, which ever afterwards marked the Sumerian temple. The earliest of these was built of crudely made mud-bricks with buttressed sides slanting inward, decorated and strengthened with pottery beakers set in rows. On top was the so-called "White Temple," oriented with its corners to the points of the compass, as was the regular custom later with sacred

buildings. In the White Temple was found a tablet of gypsum, inscribed with figures and bearing the impression of a cylinder-seal, the first of its kind known, and universally regarded as a Sumerian invention. Here we have a symbol of the earliest recognition of the principles of property and personality, and the beginning of writing. This early temple-mount was later encased in a larger ziggurat, surmounted by the Limestone Temple, so called because it had a foundation of undressed limestone blocks. This in turn was succeeded by the Red Temple, an imposing complex of buildings, with brick columns, half columns, and buttresses, gorgeously decorated with coloured cones stuck in the walls to make mosaic patterns in red, white, and black. In this temple tablets were discovered, inscribed in a crude pictographic script, the earliest written language known.[13] The signs have word values only and not syllabic, both the sexigesimal and decimal systems of reckoning are used, and the language seems quite definitely to be Sumerian. The seals in the latter part of the period show a finer technique, and on one is the unmistakable representation of a chariot. The men dressed very much as they did in the previous period, but some are represented with shaved heads and faces, an indication apparently of priestly status.

4. *The Jemdet Nasr Period.* The fourth period in early Mesopotamian history, the Jemdet Nasr, was one of increased wealth, improved means of communication, regularized trade, and the more abundant use of metal and the first use of bronze. Metal, however, was still

[13]The tablets have been published by Falkenstein, *Die archaische Texte aus Uruk*, 1936. The lesser finds from Uruk have been published by Heinrich, *Kleinfunde aus den archaischen Tempelschichten in Uruk*, 1936, while the field reports of the Uruk Expedition have appeared regularly in the *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Phil.-hist. Klasse*; summarized up to 1935 by Andrae in *Antiquity*, X, pp. 133 *ff.*

not very plentiful, and the earlier flint, obsidian, and stone utensils continued to be made. True wheat had now been produced and six-rowed barley. The script developed into the semi-pictographic, and the signs took on phonetic as well as word values, with the language definitely Sumerian.[14] From Ur in this period comes the first known sculpture in the round, a wild boar carved in steatite;[15] from Khafaje, a statuette of a woman, the earliest stone sculpture representing a human being;[16] and from Uruk, a magnificent vase, some five feet high, ornamented with sculptured reliefs in three registers.[17]

The characteristic pottery is once again a painted ware, in black and yellow on a deep red ground, often applied directly on the natural clay, but sometimes on a heavy white slip. A wide band of ornament is usually arranged in metopes around the shoulder of the pot, consisting of chequers, triangles, lozenges, double-axes, and cross-hatching. Some examples from Khafaje are painted in several registers, showing human figures in various scenes. The typical shapes are spouted jars, lugged jars with flattened rims, strap-handled bowls, plain jars, and beakers.[18] However, the commonest ware throughout the period was the pale drab pottery native to Sumer, once again showing that the new ware was due to a minority group, probably the Martu or Amurru migrants from the west. It has points of contact with the Tell Halaf ware and, like it, would seem to have its

[14]The first and largest collection of these tablets was published by Langdon, *Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts*, VII.

[15]See Woolley, *Antiquaries Journal*, X, Pl. XLIb.

[16]See Frankfort, *Illustrated London News*, Sept. 26, 1936, pp. 524, 526.

[17]See Heinrich, *op. cit.*, Pls. 2, 3, 38.

[18]For more details regarding the pottery see Mackay, *Field Museum of Natural History; Anthropology, Memoirs*, I, no. 3; Harden, *Iraq*, I, pp. 30 *ff.*; Field and Mackay, *American Journal of Archaeology*, XXXIX, pp. 310 *ff.*

home in North Syria.[19] Shuruppak (modern Fara), Eshnunna (modern Tell Asmar), and Kish were all founded in the Jemdet Nasr period, and the latter was reckoned by the Sumerians themselves as the first of their dynasties; all of which suggests that the Sumerians were overrunning and conquering Akkad at this time and were being organized as a political entity.

The Early Dynastic Period, *c.* 3000 to *c.* 2550 B.C.

With the Early Dynastic Period we pass from prehistory to history, but it is only for the second half of the period that we have actual historical texts, the earliest of these belonging to the First Dynasty of Ur, *c.* 2700 B.C.[20] It was during this dynasty that the culture of the period would seem to have reached its climax, as reflected in the truly wonderful finds of the so-called "Royal Cemetery" at Ur,[21] which, as Frankfort,[22] Müller,[23] and others have shown, cannot possibly be assigned to the early date claimed for it by Woolley, its discoverer. That the culture was a homogeneous one, which spread all over the country and even into Elam, is indicated by the similar, often identical, finds from the different sites.[24] At the same time the plano-convex bricks, which mark this period at all sites in the south, do not appear at all at

[19]Woolley, *The Development of Sumerian Art*, pp. 52 *ff.*, would have it originate in North Elam, making it akin to the al-Ubaid ware, but this is most questionable.

[20]Published by Gadd, *British Museum Quarterly*, IV, pp. 107 *ff.*; *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1928, pp. 626 *ff.*

[21]Now fully described by Woolley, *Ur Excavations, II: The Royal Cemetery*, 1934.

[22]*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1937, pp. 330 *ff.*

[23]*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LV, pp. 204 *ff.*

[24]The most remarkable of the latter is a limestone plaque, bearing a bas-relief, discovered at Ur with only one corner preserved, but completed by a larger fragment of an identical plaque in alabaster discovered at Khafaje; illustrated, *e.g.*, in Woolley, *The Development of Sumerian Art*, Pl. 45, facing p. 88.

Mari nor at any other site north of Khafaje. This would indicate that the people who introduced this kind of brick into the south did not spread into the west and north. They were an intrusive group, eventually absorbed, and were not responsible for the general culture of the period. Just why their peculiar type of brick should have replaced the older and more practical flat-sided brick, and should have continued so long in use, still remains a mystery despite the efforts of Delougaz and Müller to solve it.[25]

In the Early Dynastic period Sumer and Akkad were united into a single nation and brought the north more completely within their sphere of influence, but differences between the two regions were still to be found. The ziggurat made its way very slowly into the north, and in the southern type of temple the entrance was upon the main axis of the building, with the shrine at the end beyond a succession of courts and chambers, while in the northern type the shrine unit was a long rectangular room, with the altar at one end and the entrance upon the cross-axis at the other. The buildings were elaborately decorated and furnished, as befitting the times. The true arch was used and likewise the dome. Another mark of advancing culture was the fact that the Sumerians had now a fully developed language, written in cuneiform script, a conventionalization of the earlier pictographs.

Metal of all kinds was much more abundant and was beautifully worked, as is best represented in the remarkable finds from the "Royal Cemetery" at Ur, with gold objects as fine in technique and design as the goldsmith's art anywhere or at any time could make them.[26] The

[25]Delougaz, *Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization*, no. 7; Müller, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LVII, pp. 84 *ff.* If the bricks were originated to imitate stone, as contended by both authors, they would be laid with the convex side out, but this is never done.

[26]Described and illustrated in Woolley, *Ur Excavations, II: The Royal Cemetery*, 1934.

smiths could braze and solder, and hence could make filigree work. The closed mould was known and likewise the more difficult *cire perdue* method of moulding, one of the earliest examples being a magnificent group of three copper statuettes from Khafaje.[27] Even glass and iron appear sporadically.[28]

As is to be expected, less attention was given to pottery. In this period it is characterized by a reserved slip, *i.e.*, the pot was covered with a fine slip and then this was partly wiped away, usually in parallel stripes. Sculpture in the round was still rather crude, but much taste and skill are shown in the many examples of bas-relief. Other crafts characteristic of the period are the inlaying of figures cut from shell or mother-of-pearl and the extensive manufacture of seals, exquisitely cut in every material from shell to lapis lazuli.

The Old Akkadian Period, *c.* 2550 to *c.* 2370 B.C.

The rise of Sargon the Great to power and his conquest of Lugal-zaggisi, the Sumerian king of Uruk (biblical Erech), mark the beginning of a new epoch, the political ascendancy of the Semitic Akkadians. However, this is not the first appearance of Semites in Mesopotamian history. The later kings of the Dynasty of Akshak, as recorded by the king-lists, and all the kings of the Fourth Dynasty of Kish bear Semitic names, while the recent excavations at Mari show a line of Semitic kings established there as early apparently as 2750 B.C., some two hundred years before Sargon.[29] It was not until the time of Sargon, however, that the Semites came into their

[27]See Frankfort, *Oriental Institute Communications* (henceforth abbreviated *OIC*), no. 13, pp. 76 *ff.*

[28]See Frankfort, *OIC*, no. 17, pp. 56 *ff.*; Richardson, *American Journal of Archaeology*, XXXVIII, pp. 555 *ff.*; Beck, *Ancient Egypt*, 1934, pp. 7 *ff.*

[29]The excavations are reported by Parrot, *Mari: une ville perdue*, 1936.

own. His kingdom not only included the whole of Mesopotamia, but extended westward to the Mediterranean Sea and eastward into Elam. Its prosperity is shown by the business documents of the time, of which the largest collection, and the one most recently recovered, comes from Gasur (later Nuzi).[30] Trading colonies were established in Cappadocia, while recent finds in Mesopotamia and the Indus Valley show extensive relations with far-away India.[31]

The culture of the time is reflected in such works of art as the famous victory stela of Naram-Sin,[32] to which can now be added the magnificent bronze head recently discovered at Nineveh.[33] The cylinder-seals are particularly fine, being marked by the excellence of their cutting and design and the miniature technique of their carving; they usually depict religious and mythological scenes. One of the latter is of great interest because it shows the slaying of a seven-headed monster, which must be the prototype of the slaying of the Hydra by Hercules.[34] The finding of a complete service set in bronze at Tell Asmar[35] would seem to indicate that the ancient Akkadians even used utensils corresponding to our knives, forks, and spoons. An evidence of the virility of their culture is the fact that their language largely replaced the immemorial Sumerian in the inscriptions of the day; and

[30]Published by Meek, *Old Akkadian, Sumerian, and Cappadocian Texts from Nuzi*, 1935.

[31]See, *e.g.*, Gadd, *Seals of Ancient Indian Style found at Ur*, 1932; Frankfort, *OIC*, no. 16, pp. 47 *ff.*; no. 17, p. 22; Mackay, *Antiquity*, V, pp. 459 *ff.*; Corbiau, *Iraq*, III, pp. 100 *ff.*; IV, pp. 1 *ff.*

[32]See, *e.g.*, Zervos, *L'Art de la Mesopotamie*, 1935, Pls. 164-7.

[33]See Mallowan, *Iraq*, III, pp. 104 *ff.*

[34]See Frankfort, *OIC*, no. 17, pp. 53 *ff.*; Levy, *Journal of Hellenistic Studies*, LIV, pp. 40 *ff.* Another very recent find at Khafaje, indicating a connection between Babylonian and Greek mythology, is a small relief of *c.* 2000 B.C. depicting a cyclops; see *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, LIII, p. 67.

[35]See Frankfort, *OIC*, no. 17, pp. 21, 38 *ff.*

these are universally written in a beautifully executed script, even in the most ordinary documents.

The Gutian and Ur III Periods, *c.* 2400 to *c.* 2183 B.C.

Concerning the Gutians we still have very little exact information. They seem to have been a Caucasian people, allied to, or coming from, the same parent stock as the Elamites, Hurrians, and Kassites. It was in the later years of their declining power that the Sumerian, Gudea, seems to have ruled as governor at Lagash, and prepared the way by his brilliant achievements for the great revival of Sumerian power in the Ur III dynasty, beginning *c.* 2290 B.C. Of all periods in the history of Mesopotamia, this probably was the most prosperous. In no other are business records so abundant; and the excavations at Ur itself show the city at the height of its power and glory,[36] with its kings revered and worshipped as gods in temples of their own.[37] The dynasty represents the return of the Sumerians to power, with Sumerian once again the official language of the state, but the personal names of the time show the Semites playing an ever-increasing and more important role, until even the kings themselves came to take on Semitic names.[38] The personal names also show the first appearance of Hurrian migrants into the country. Toward the end of the dynasty Amorites invaded the land from the west, and Elamites from the east, and between the two Sumerian political power was finally snuffed out, never again to be revived.

[36]See, *e.g.*, Woolley, *Ur of the Chaldees*, pp. 112 *ff.*; to be described at length in *Ur Excavations*, V.

[37]For the magnificent mausoleum of Shulgi see Woolley, *Antiquaries Journal*, XI, pp. 355 *ff.*; to be described at length in *Ur Excavations*, VI.

[38]*Viz.*, Bur-Sin, Shu-Sin (formerly read Gimil-Sin), and Ibi-Sin. The names of the first two kings, now read Ur-Nammu and Shulgi, are Sumerian.

The Old Babylonian Period, *c.* 2050 to *c.* 1750 B.C.

With the decline and fall of Ur the country fell into a state of savage warfare among the several city-states, the intricacies of which are not easy to follow. The various date-formulae of the time help us somewhat in ascertaining the order of events, and new light has come from the excavations at Tell Asmar (ancient Eshnunna) and Tell Hariri (ancient Mari). We now have the names of a considerable line of rulers at Eshnunna, covering a period of more than three hundred years down to the thirty-first year of Hammurabi, when he conquered Eshnunna;[39] and from Mari have come the names of a line of rulers ending with Zimri-Lim, whom Hammurabi conquered in his thirty-third year.[40] Only a few of the tablets from Mari have been published. There remain thousands of others, many of them letters from the time of Hammurabi and addressed to Zimri-Lim from all parts of Mesopotamia. The letter already published by Thureau-Dangin[41] shows how very important these are and what a flood of light they will shed on what is now an obscure period.

Mari was an Amorite state, and it was Ishbi-Irra from Mari who founded the Isin dynasty, which gradually replaced the Ur III dynasty. A formidable rival, and ultimate conqueror, was the dynasty of Larsa, like Eshnunna closely leagued with the Elamites; but more formidable than it, and eventually the conqueror of all, was the great Hammurabi of Babylon.[42]

[39]See Frankfort and Jacobsen, *OIC*, no. 13, pp. 25-50.

[40]See Parrot, *op. cit.*, p. 236; Thureau-Dangin, *Revue d'Assyriologie*, XXXIII, pp. 49 *ff.*, 169 *ff.*

[41]*Revue d'Assyriologie*, XXXIII, pp. 171 *ff.* The letters have been committed to Dossin and Jean for publication; for a summary of their contents see Dossin, *Comptes rendus*, Jan.-March, 1937, pp. 12 *ff.*

[42]In view of popular misunderstanding it may not be amiss to note that the identification of Hammurabi with the Amraphel of Gen. xiv has long been

The Old Babylonian period has not left much in the way of great material remains; it is noted rather for its intense literary activity, much of it editorial. Hammurabi's famous code of laws has long been known, and thousands of letters bear witness to the literacy of a considerable proportion of the population, as do the thousands of school-texts. Books of omens were collected and illustrated from history, and the scribes even undertook the writing of history itself, of which the king-lists are a digest. Myths like the Creation and Flood stories were re-edited; hymns and prayers were collated, the pantheon organized, and the religion systematized, the whole being given a Sumerian complexion because, after all, Babylonian culture had its roots in the old and was much more Sumerian than Semitic. Sumerian was no longer a spoken language, but it continued to be used in religion, and for its elucidation grammars and lexicons were prepared.

The period is noteworthy, too, for its scientific attainments. Knowledge of the heavens, gained from astrology, was being used for practical purposes, but did not develop into astronomy until much later. The day was divided into twelve double-hours, with sundials used to measure the daylight and waterclocks the night. Treatises on medicine were prepared involving a remarkable acquaintance with chemistry,[43] even though motivated by superstition. Advances were also made in the knowledge of the fauna, as well as of the rocks and stones. But it was in the realm of mathematics that the Babylonians made the most remarkable advance. Like the Egyptians, the

abandoned by all scholars of authority, so that there is no proof whatsoever that Abraham belonged to the time of Hammurabi; he probably came considerably later; see Meek, *Hebrew Origins*, pp. 13 *ff.*

[43]Through extensive research Thompson has made himself the authority in this field; see his most recent volume, *A Dictionary of Assyrian Geology and Chemistry*, 1936.

early Sumerians used the additive method to multiply and divide, but before 2000 B.C. the Babylonians had evolved multiplication tables, and also tables of reciprocals, of squares, cubes, and other powers, of square roots, cube roots, and the like. Moreover, by 2000 B.C. they had attained a complete mastery of fractional quantities and had developed a very exact terminology in mathematics. The correct geometrical formula for calculating the area of a rectangle was known to the Sumerians before 3000 B.C. and in the years that followed came the knowledge of how to find the area of triangles, circles, irregular quadrangles and polygons, truncated pyramids, cones, and the like, but in most instances the results were only approximately correct because of a defective technique, such as giving π the value of 3. By 2000 B.C. the theorem attributed to Pythagoras was familiar to the Babylonians, and they could solve problems involving equations of the first, second, third, and fourth degrees, as well as sets of equations with two, three, and four unknowns.[44]

The Kassite Period and After, *c.* 1750 to 538 B.C.

The decadence that followed the death of Hammurabi, *c.* 1913 B.C., saw the extensive migration of Hurrians into the north, the secession of the Sea-Land Dynasty in the south, *c.* 1880 B.C.,[45] the sack of Babylon by a raiding troop of Hittites, and finally the conquest of southern Mesopotamia by the Kassites, beginning *c.* 1750 B.C. The long years of Kassite domination (down

[44]The two scholars who have done most to publish and interpret Babylonian mathematical texts are Thureau-Dangin, in numerous articles in the *Revue d'Assyriologie*, and Neugebauer in various articles and such books as *Mathematische Keilschrift-Texte*, parts 1-3, 1934-7, and *Vorlesungen über Geschichte der antiken mathematischen Wissenschaften*, I: *Vorgriechische Mathematik*, 1934.

[45]For a recently published text to be added to the few from the time of this dynasty, see Gadd and Thompson, *Iraq*, III, pp. 87 *ff*. It contains the earliest known formula for the making of glazes.

to *c.* 1171 B.C.) still remain pretty much a blank. In fact nothing particularly new regarding Mesopotamia has come to light in recent years until we get into the Neo-Babylonian period, 626-538 B.C. The German finds at Babylon add considerably to our knowledge of this period,[46] and the researches of Dougherty have shed welcome light on the end of the period.[47] We know now that Nabonidus, the last king, spent a large part of his reign at distant Tema in North Arabia, leaving the home government meanwhile in the hands of his son, Belshazzar.

By the time of the Neo-Babylonians astrology had definitely developed into astronomy, represented in the later period by such men of science as Nabu-rimanni, *c.* 425 B.C., and Kidinnu, *c.* 300 B.C. In the latter's "Canon of Eclipses" there is actually a more accurate value for the motion of the Sun from the Node than the one used in our standard modern Canon, that of Oppolzer. As early apparently as Nabu-nasir, *c.* 747 B.C., the Babylonians began to use the nineteen-year cycle for the intercalary month, which was later adopted by the Jews and is still used by them down to the present day. Elaborate calculations were made of the movements of the sun and moon, and tables were prepared of the planets in their orbits, with exact calendars for extensive periods of their helical risings and settings. In short, it was the Babylonians who laid the foundations of the science of astronomy and passed it on to the Greeks.[48]

Assyrian Beginnings, *c.* 3000 to *c.* 1850 B.C.

As we have already noted, the earliest culture of Mesopotamia, the Tell Halaf, was found in the extreme

[46]Best presented in Unger, *Babylon*, 1931.

[47]See particularly his *Nabonidus and Belshazzar*, 1929.

[48]See, *e.g.*, Fotheringham, *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Mathematik, Astronomie und Physik*, II, pp. 28 *ff.*

north alone, but the al-Ubaid was partly contemporaneous with this and thereafter Assyria went through pretty much the same periods of development as did Sumer and Akkad, except that it was not largely affected by the Uruk and Jemdet Nasr cultures and naturally was open to influences in the north that did not reach as far south as Sumer and Akkad.

The origin of the Assyrians themselves is still wrapped in mystery. They were unquestionably an amalgam of many stocks, an amalgam that came ultimately to take on a Semitic complexion. The earliest references to the city of Ashur are found in the Old Akkadian texts from Nuzi, and the Assyrian there mentioned bears a Semitic name.[49] Also, the earliest known Assyrian inscriptions (from *c.* 2300 B.C. and later) are written in Semitic (Old Assyrian). These are royal inscriptions discovered at Ashur and have added considerably to our knowledge of early Assyria.[50]

It was in the Old Akkadian period, apparently in the time of Sargon, that Assyrian trading colonies were established in Cappadocia, and from their descendants in the Ur III period have come thousands of business documents.[51] It is recognized now that these are written in Old Assyrian, but they follow a script and syllabary peculiar to themselves. A few tablets identical with them have been uncovered outside Cappadocia at Nuzi, the only tablets of their kind so far published.[52] The colonists were attracted to Cappadocia, among other things, by the silver mined in Cilicia, and this now rapidly displaced grain as a medium of exchange. Bars

[49]See Meek, *Old Akkadian, Sumerian, and Cappadocian Texts from Nuzi*, p. xi.

[50]Translated into English by Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, I, 1926.

[51]The most recent publication in English is Gelb, *Inscriptions from Alishar and Vicinity*, 1935.

[52]Published by Meek, *op. cit.*, nos. 223-7.

and even round pieces of the metal were stamped with their weight, and these spread all over the Near East as money. With the Cappadocians also arose the idea of credit; for some of the tablets state that they represent a specified number of shekels of silver and so are the earliest known form of cheque or draft.

THE ASSYRIAN KINGDOM, *c.* 1850 to *c.* 1100 B.C.

Not until the decline of the Old Babylonian dynasty did Assyria come into its own, stimulated perhaps by an extensive migration of Hurrians into the country. Until recently these people were practically unknown, but thanks particularly to the excavations at Nuzi[53] we now know a great deal about them.[54] Here they settled in such numbers that they changed the ancient Sumerian name of the city, Gasur, to one of their own, Nuzi Although they were a non-Semitic people who, apparently, came down from the Caucasian highlands and settled in Assyria, they wrote their texts in a dialect of Babylonian. These have been found in thousands[55] and throw important light, not only on their time (the fifteenth century and early fourteenth), but on the origin of the Hebrews as well, with whom they were closely associated.[56]

Another important find bearing on the Middle Assyrian period is the collection of Assyrian laws discovered in the excavations at Ashur. These were published by Schroeder, in 1920, and have recently been treated most exhaustively by Driver and Miles.[57] The

[53]Reported by Starr, *Nuzi*, 1937; summarized by Pfeiffer in the Smithsonian Report for 1935, pp. 535-8.

[54]See, *e.g.*, Götze, *Hethiter, Churriter und Assyrer*, 1936.

[55]The most recent publication is Pfeiffer and Speiser, *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, XVI, 1937.

[56]See Meek, *Hebrew Origins*, pp. 3-15, with the literature there cited. We now know the Hurrians are to be identified with the Horites of the Old Testament.

[57]*The Assyrian Laws*, 1935.

laws show certain points of contact with the Hammurabi Code, but also points of difference, so that they are distinctly Assyrian.

The Assyrian Empire, *c.* 1100 to 626 B.C.

The most important single contribution to our knowledge of this period is Waterman's complete edition of the corpus of royal Assyrian letters in four large volumes.[58] We have already noted the light shed on ancient Assyria by the most recent excavations at Nineveh. The earlier excavations, under the same direction, have contributed some important inscriptions of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal,[59] together with information of a more general character, while the expedition of the University of Chicago at Khorsabad has supplemented considerably our knowledge of Sargon's capital and its vicinity.[60] For the very end of the Assyrian Empire we have had for some time now a highly important text, which shows that Ashur fell to the Babylonians and Medes in 614 B.C., Nineveh in 612, and the last remnant of the Assyrian army at Harran in 609.[61] And so perished the mightiest empire of the ancient Semitic world, the victim of its own overweening ambition, leaving little but its great works of art by which to be remembered.[62]

[58] *Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire*, I-IV, 1930-6.

[59] See Thompson, *The Prisms of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal Found at Nineveh*, 1932.

[60] See Loud, *Khorsabad*, I, 1936; Jacobsen and Lloyd, *Sennacherib's Aqueduct at Jerwan*, 1936. In the latter publication we have the description of a remarkable aqueduct that brought the cool water of the mountains all the way to Nineveh, even carrying it by bridge-work across a wide ravine. It is a type of construction nowhere else surviving from pre-Roman times.

[61] Gadd, *The Fall of Nineveh*, 1923.

[62] Well treated by Gadd, *Stones of Assyria*, 1936. Note the Assyrian wall-paintings discovered at Tell Ahmar; Thureau-Dangin *et al.*, *Til-Barsib*, 1936.

REVIEWS

SHAKESPEARE: A DIVERSITY OF DOCTRINE

R. S. Knox

The theoretic justification of the labours of critics and scholars on Shakespeare's drama is, presumably, that our enjoyment of the plays may thereby be enriched with a fuller understanding. In ignorance of Coleridge or Bradley or a hundred others, we may draw, each in his capacity, our share of pleasure from the plays, but for the deeper vision we must submit to the guidance of those more sensitive minds. Moreover, Shakespeare may be for all time but he was also of an age, and until we are aware of the peculiar medium for which his art was designed and the contemporary conditions from which it issued, we can never know it in its fulness. What knowledge the researching scholar has gained he hands to the critic; and they march side by side, a band of truth-seekers, intent for our benefit on plucking out the heart of Shakespeare's mystery. That is the theory. In fact neither the past history of Shakespeare studies nor their present state can be held to realize this ideal co-operation; and, in his search for guidance, the layman may be sorely perplexed. He will have his choice of many masters, all guaranteeing the only true solution; but, rightly giving his fealty to none, he will patiently listen and turn back to himself and Shakespeare.

The history of recent *Hamlet* criticism affords a good sample of this diversity of doctrine. Some fifteen years ago Bradley's imaginative analysis of the play, with its exhibition of Shakespeare's careful art and of the fine psychological coherence in the hero's character, held the field. But a reaction set in. The historical and realist critics had been at work. Despising the romantic mood of acceptance, they boldly doubted whether all in the play was as it should be, or insisted on a reconsideration of the very nature of Shakespeare's art. It is only fair to discriminate between the findings of those critics, but for some at least the main conclusion was that *Hamlet*, "full of gorgeous poetry and profound flashes of insight, is dramatically a thing of shreds and patches, that Shakespeare was, as usual, adapting an old play for his company, in the way of business, that the crudity of the original plot and

characters made it impossible for him to carry through his revision without leaving loose ends and inconsistencies in many places, and that in particular the mystery of Hamlet's character may be simply explained as a failure to fuse completely the old material with the new." Even Mr. T. S. Eliot lent his pontifical authority to this view: "So far from being Shakespeare's masterpiece, the play is most certainly an artistic failure."

It is in opposition to this verdict that Professor Dover Wilson has written his latest book, *What Happens in Hamlet*, the title of which states precisely what he sets out to demonstrate.[1] He agrees with the historical critics that the play is full of obscurities; "but when they go on to explain these as 'relics of an old play' or as due to the stubbornness of Shakespeare's material, without stopping to enquire whether what seems obscure may not conceal some 'necessary point of the play' which they have failed to grasp, they sin against a primary canon of criticism." Indeed, we have hitherto been blind to the extraordinary care with which the play is built, to its delicate dramatic filigree; and, by analysing the structure and clarifying Shakespeare's intentions on point after point, Professor Dover Wilson sheds, he believes, new light on the play's meaning.

He holds that the usurpation motive and Hamlet's ambitious designs, as Claudius sees them, have not hitherto been sufficiently stressed, with the result that the relations between the two men have been misconstrued. He would remind us of the heinous nature of Gertrude's sin, both incest and adultery. From his knowledge of Elizabethan spiritualism, a field neglected by the historical critics, he would show a new subtlety in Shakespeare's treatment of the Ghost. While Marcellus and Bernardo typify the ghost-lore of the average unthinking Elizabethan and the medieval Catholic view that the Ghost is the spirit of the deceased from Purgatory, Hamlet and Horatio are students from Wittenberg, and Hamlet's recurring doubts about the Ghost reflect his Protestant prepossessions. Thus the reference in the soliloquy to

> The undiscovered country, from whose bourn
> No traveller returns,

far from being evidence of Shakespeare's carelessness, as a critic

[1] *What Happens in Hamlet*, by J. Dover Wilson, Cambridge University Press (Macmillan Co. of Canada), 1935.

like Schücking would have it, falls into its correct place as a detail in the dramatic structure. Some of the strange happenings in the "cellarage" scene are explained by reference to one of the best-known ghost-books of the period, Lavater's *Of Ghostes and Spirites Walking by Night*. When, for instance, Hamlet addresses the spirit as if it were a devil, a familiar, father and son are really playing into each other's hands to circumvent the inconvenient presence of Marcellus. By a meaningful mention of Saint Patrick Horatio is given the hint that it is really an honest ghost. It may be unfair to Professor Dover Wilson's thesis to isolate in this fashion a few of the novelties, but we cannot help feeling that he himself makes too much of them. That the Ghost, and Hamlet's doubts about it, meant far more to the Elizabethans than they can ever mean to us, no one would deny; but to suggest that the effect of the "cellarage" scene, with Hamlet's queer levity and his urgent need of secrecy, cannot be rightly appreciated without a scholar's knowledge of Lavater is surely to contradict experience. It is our imaginative sympathy which is called for more than our ability to follow a cryptic argument. In his new explanations of the "nunnery" scene there is the same ingenuity. He postulates a stage direction by which Hamlet enters to overhear Polonius' plan to "loose" his daughter, a term, we are told, associated with the mating of animals. This is required to explain Hamlet's "fishmonger" talk with Polonius and his warning, "Let her not walk i' the sun." But it also "renders the nunnery scene playable and intelligible as never before." Hamlet knows that Ophelia is a decoy immediately he sets eyes on her, and is aware that the King and Polonius are behind the arras.

> Nymph, in thy orisons
> Be all my sins remembered,

is spoken in bitter sarcasm. This theory, we suggest, not only unjustifiably tampers with the text but gains nothing by wronging Hamlet. As Mr. Granville-Barker says: "The result will be to rob Hamlet's part in the scene of all the ebb and flow of tenderness and regret, inexplicable suffering and passion, to reduce it to a dead level of resentment, to make him, indeed, something of a self-righteous scold."

Those, however, are minor contentions compared with Professor Dover Wilson's revised version of the play-scene. We may not be

convinced, but for sheer dexterity of argumentation the chapter is a masterpiece. His main conclusions are that the dumb-show, a structural necessity for the audience, comes as a surprise to Hamlet. He had definitely censured such pantomimes; and now he sees those stupid players endangering the success of his plot—"miching mallecho, it means mischief." But the King does not see the dumb-show; at the moment he is speaking to Polonius and Gertrude, and later enquires about the argument. And on the spur of the moment, as he always acts, Hamlet identifies the poisoner as "Lucianus, nephew to the King," for he wants to make the court think that he is threatening Claudius' life. Only here the neatly built argument seems to wobble. Hamlet chooses to give this impression in order to shield his mother's honour, the mother whom he had pointedly and publicly shamed in the Player Queen's lines:

> In second husband let me be accurst!
> None wed the second but who killed the first.

Mr. Granville-Barker in his *Hamlet* gives an orthodox refutation of this new interpretation of the play-scene; and, of course, both critics defend their views on the same grounds: "The right answer will emerge from the text and the situation involved in it; we have only straightforwardly to work this out, instead of dodging or shirking the issue."

The value of Professor Dover Wilson's book lies not so much in his new interpretations, in the finality of which he seems over-confident, as in the general masterly analysis of the play's structure, and especially in the chapter on "Hamlet's Make-up." Here his discussion of Shakespeare's art of progressive revelation, of the methods by which a character is gradually created, not necessarily psychologically explicable or consistent but so as to bring out the complete illusion of reality, is admirably lucid. Yet with his final reading of the Hamlet tragedy as one of failure, of a plain duty shirked through weakness of will, we wholly disagree. Hamlet's is the tragedy of a mind out of harmony with its world, the tragedy of "thwarted thought and tortured spirit." To talk of him as "blameworthy for his neglect" is merely irrelevant.

Mr. Granville-Barker's *Hamlet*, the latest of his series of *Prefaces to Shakespeare*, is a quieter study.[2] Here again he exhibits

[2] *Prefaces to Shakespeare, Third Series, Hamlet*, by Harley Granville-Barker, Sidgwick and Jackson, 1937.

that rare fusion of imaginative insight and scholarship with a practical knowledge of the theatre. In a first chapter, sub-titled "The Genius of the Workshop," he discusses the development in Shakespeare's drama which led to *Hamlet*. The very basis of his art was collaboration with the actors, and already, beyond any former dramatist, he had given plays which allowed them free scope for the presentment of character. But in those his main medium had been prose, and prose does not lend itself to the poignancies of tragedy. With *Hamlet* Shakespeare realized character in poetry. He provided the actor with a medium by which not only the "physics" but the "metaphysics" of a figure could be revealed. "And when the dramatist is such a poet as Shakespeare these metaphysics will be of the kind with which poetry is most concerned, the world of the imagination and the things of the spirit; they will, it is not too fantastic to say, begin to give the character something very like an immortal soul." After considering the general nature of the play's action and pointing to what is gained by the free use of place and time—"Shakespeare's true concern is with tempo not time"—Mr. Granville-Barker takes us step by step through the four movements into which he divides the play. As an example of the acuteness with which he perceives the nature and effect of Shakespeare's art, there is his passing comment on the "prayer" scene. Every critic has given his explanation of Hamlet's reason for sparing the King, but we can recollect none who before has asked us to dwell upon the terrible stroke of irony, "upon a Claudius battling within himself for his salvation and losing, and a Hamlet refusing to kill him lest he should not be damned."

Having studied the play for its action, as a thing of movement, Mr. Granville-Barker touches briefly on the import of the First Quarto, examines the verse texture and the image patterns as these contribute to the play's effects, and then turns to the characters. Here he gives an interesting restatement of an old conclusion. Shakespeare has conceived Hamlet as "a man adrift from old faiths and not yet anchored in new, a man of his time in that," and this creature of his imagination has to be reconciled with the figure of the borrowed story. "The Hamlet we have is the tragic product of his very failure to do so. The unfitness of the man for his task is at once plain. But Hamlet's continuing effort to be at the same time—so to put it—Kyd's hero and Shakespeare's reveals deeper incongruities. It involves him in a rupture of the entire spiritual

treaty between himself and the world in which he must live, and in a conflict between two selves within him, the one that would agree with this world, the other that cannot. There is the fundamental tragedy." So the realist critics are answered. The very impossibility of the fusion of the old and new, which they had seen as an artistic muddle, is integral to Shakespeare's conception of Hamlet.

But even Mr. Granville-Barker is a mundane guide compared with Mr. Middleton Murry.[3] To see *Hamlet* with Mr. Murry is literally to look into the recesses of Shakespeare's soul. In his recent book he re-asserts more boldly than ever the romantic attitude: "There remains, when all is said and done, an instantly felt discrepancy between Shakespeare and the application of a rigorous critical method. . . . The results of science and the deliverance of the Imagination are in opposition. It is unlikely that it is the Imagination which is at fault." Not that Mr. Murry is unaware of, or ignores, the findings of the historians. He admits that, by the gradual establishment of the conception of Shakespeare as primarily an Elizabethan playwright, dependent on the theatre for his livelihood, we have come nearer to making him credible than before. Nevertheless, the attempt to interpret him through the alleged psychological limitations of an Elizabethan audience leaves the substance of the romantic criticism intact. They may have understood him in different ways from ours, but it does not follow that our way is wrong. Just as Shakespeare had incomparably the faculty for self-submission to experience in all its forms, so "we find that those who have discovered in themselves some kindred faculty for self-submission to the work he has left us, are those whose names are most certainly imperishable in the long roll of his critics."

In the first part of his book Mr. Murry follows Shakespeare's creative career up to the writing of *Hamlet*. He accepts Keats's explanation of "negative capability" as the best description of Shakespeare's poetic character, and, in accord with this, holds that Shakespeare's early style would more likely be imitative than highly individual. There need be no scruples in accepting even *Titus Andronicus* as authentic pupil work. The distinctive Shakespeare manner gradually emerged; and the features of this Mr. Murry admirably expounds. In the sonnets he finds em-

[3] *Shakespeare*, by John Middleton Murry, Jonathan Cape, 1936.

bodied the most crucial experience in Shakespeare's life, the record of a friendship with the Earl of Southampton and their final alienation, when Shakespeare, disillusioned with aristocratic patronage, accepted his destiny as a public playwright. "The Shakespeare of 1595 onwards is a man who has won a victory of which he had momentarily despaired, who has fused not merely the poet and dramatist in himself, but established a unique creative relation between himself, his dramatic material, his audience and his actors. He has conquered his necessities by submitting to them." There follows a discussion of Shakespeare's treatment of English history. From his own metaphysical point of view Mr. Murry restates the significance of *Richard II*. Shakespeare now regards history not as a detached spectacle but as a process whose reality must be sought by imaginative penetration. The reality in *Richard II* is York's plea for the necessity of order. Moreover, since imagination is an act of the whole being, it is quite natural that this new view of history should coincide with a moment of growth in Shakespeare's poetic consciousness. He is now aware of the discrepancy between experience and his own expression of it, "in which the working of fancy is as yet predominant over that of imagination." The next four histories, from *King John* to *Henry V*, are a creative expression of the growing self-consciousness of the nation, but they express it so richly precisely because "they were created to satisfy the exigencies of the life in Shakespeare." Seeking his independence through the support of the English people, Shakespeare became the voice of the new self-reliant England.

Mr. Murry's gift for finding new depth in an old idea is seen very clearly in his chapter on "The Shakespeare Man." There are, he maintains and most of us would allow, certain figures in the plays exceptionally vital and, as it were, creatively related—the Bastard, Mercutio, Hotspur, Benedick, Falstaff. These are the characters with which Shakespeare could identify himself, into which "his creative spontaneity could pour itself without constraint." But their very vitality tended to sap the plays in which they appeared. Where Shakespeare the artist is in control, the Shakespeare Man is absent. To save the art the Shakespeare Man must go, and he can be overcome only "by bringing him to his height" and making him in his fulness the substance of a play. That play is *Hamlet*. "What, then, becomes of the law we

fancied," asks Mr. Murry, "by which, when he appears, he tends to sap the life which seeks to be impersonally spread through the whole drama? It is operative, operative in the highest degree; for the law now becomes the inward life of the drama itself. That is what *Hamlet* is—the expression in drama of that law." In his interpretation of the play Mr. Murry, with the critic's usual assurance, finds what he seeks. For him, as for Dr. Johnson, Hamlet, in his question "To be or not to be," is asking whether we exist after death or not. In the old play the Ghost's function had been to command revenge. In Shakespeare's he does this but also implants in Hamlet's soul a new horror of death or rather of what comes after death, which for a time prevents him from taking revenge. "For it is in the main in his conquering his fear of the unknown futurity that Hamlet's victory lies. That is the central line of his progress and his growth." Hamlet's faith in life had gone; what for him was the warrant of Order had been destroyed. But in the end he finds a new Order. He attains the mood when "readiness is all." There were two Hamlets, not as the literalists would have it, that of the old play and of the new, but the Hamlet who acted on instinct and the Hamlet made immobile by thought. In the end they became one, "himself in his own final spontaneity." Hamlet, far from being a failure, is a triumphant man, or rather "triumphant Man." In his introductory chapter Mr. Murry claims that the essential truth about Shakespeare is that "he *is* life itself." Certainly he is, in that we are all entitled to try to get what we want out of him.

In the remaining chapters Mr. Murry continues his highly individual readings of the plays, finding for the most part a central light by which they become interestingly illuminated. In *Othello* it is "the wonder of the handkerchief;" in *Macbeth* it is his thraldom to time, "chained to the wheel of an everlasting Now;" in *Antony and Cleopatra* it is the stress on "royal." *Lear* Mr. Murry refuses to rank with the other tragedies. It was a vision which Shakespeare's imagination did not master. *The Tempest* is Shakespeare's dream of a re-born humanity. We may have doubts about the validity of some of Mr. Murry's play interpretations. We may feel that at moments he passes beyond us, and even beyond Shakespeare, into a mystical world of his own. There is, on the other hand, no questioning his power when revealing the qualities of Shakespeare's expression, whether in the analysis of single

passages or when in his chapter on "Imagery and Imagination" he traces its deepening utterance as the poetry more and more takes its part in the general imaginative working-out of the play.

The study of Shakespeare's imagery is the latest critical fashion, and its most industrious English pioneer has been Professor Caroline Spurgeon. In her recent book[4] she not only gathers up abundant material on which further studies may be based, but answers the double question which she has set herself: What light is thrown by the imagery on Shakespeare the man and on the themes and characters of the plays? The poet, even the objective dramatist like Shakespeare, she holds, through the stuff chosen for his imagery unconsciously gives himself away. She compares, supplementing her comparisons with a sheaf of coloured charts, the range and types of Shakespeare's imagery with those of his contemporaries. The results here almost fully accord with our superficial impressions. Shakespeare's distinction is shown to lie in the predominance of images from nature, the English countryside, and daily indoor life; and the common quality which marks them is movement. Indeed, this instinct for giving life to the inanimate, this dramatic bent even on the level of language, is one of the obvious clues to the magic of his expression. After a series of chapters in which she collates the images to reveal the characteristics of "Shakespeare's Senses" and his "Tastes and Interests," Professor Spurgeon discusses his "Association of Ideas," the tendency to link "a certain chain of ideas round some particular emotional or mental stimulus," exemplifying with the now notorious "dog, licking, candy, melting group, called up inevitably by the thought of false friends or flatterers." This is for the most part closely pertinent to our understanding of Shakespeare's art. Whether the further step she takes, of educing from the nature of the imagery a mental and even physical portrait of the dramatist, can be justified or regarded as significant is another question. Even if we were to admit what is at best doubtful, that Shakespeare's knowledge of the carpenter's craft means that he was "probably a practical, neat and handy man about the house," is there really much thereby gained? In all likelihood he did suffer from "smoky chimneys, stopped ovens, guttering evil-smelling candles and ill-trimmed lamps, as well as greasy, badly-cooked food

[4] *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us*, by Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, Cambridge University Press (Macmillan Co. of Canada), 1935.

and tainted or musty meat;" but from the evidence of the images could it seriously be deduced that "the figure which emerges is of a compactly well-built man, probably on the slight side"? For Professor Spurgeon, it may be noted, not Hamlet but Horatio is the Shakespeare man, "balanced in the midst of the whirlpool of passion."

There can be no doubt about the contribution made by the second half of the book. Here she is wholly concerned with Shakespeare's art, with the nature and function of the imagery in the play groups and in the individual plays. Her most interesting results come from the exemplification of recurrent images in the tragedies. These, like the "sickness" images in *Hamlet* or the "animal" images in *Lear*, have often been noted, but no one has hitherto shown so explicitly their relation to the imaginative vision which informs the whole play. In such work there is the obvious danger of imposing a self-picked pattern on the elusive Shakespeare stuff. If we think that Professor Spurgeon has not altogether avoided this, it may merely mean that we also stubbornly prefer our own interpretations.

In the conflict of contemporary criticism no one has been more to the front than Professor Stoll. In book after book he has countered the older psychologists, demonstrating what was in danger of being forgotten, that poetic drama is life not transcribed but artfully manipulated for definite emotional effects. That, the main Stoll contention, few to-day would think of denying, although more might demur at some of his further deductions from it. There need be no such reservations, or almost none, in accepting and relishing what he has to say about *Shakespeare's Young Lovers*, the subject of his Alexander lectures delivered in this University.[5] The first lecture he gives to *Romeo and Juliet;* and we can have no qualms in agreeing that in this play at any rate "the presentation of character is poetical rather than psychological or ethical," that it is vain to seek for a tragic flaw where the struggle is merely against the stars. Throughout the closely reasoned argument only once or twice is one stayed doubtingly. In his distaste for psychology when absurdly in-read, Professor Stoll sometimes forces his denial and unnecessarily finds Shakespeare deliberately violating a life truth. Is it, for instance, "contrary to nature that in the

[5] *Shakespeare's Young Lovers*, by E. E. Stoll, Oxford University Press, 1937.

presence of Juliet the romantic Romeo should forget Rosaline at once and for good and all"? Certainly the dramatist's purpose is to throw Romeo's love for Juliet into high relief, but surely to do so he has merely romantically accentuated what is by no means unreal. But in this lecture, and in the two which follow, the distinction lies not so much in the analysis of the play structure of which the figures form a part, as in the straight discussion of Shakespeare's art of characterization. What this means, and more significantly what it does not mean, for Professor Stoll are perhaps best suggested by his comment on Imogen:

> The enchantment of her, the very identity of her is, as generally with Shakespeare, realized in her utterance. Her psychology, we shall see,—that is, her mental structure and point of view—is not clearly or consistently indicated. Indeed, it is not motives or *arrières pensées* that are given us but the external psychology—the surface of the mind—temperament and inclinations, sentiments and ways of thinking, as they hang together; and after the Shakespearean fashion, these traits—her charms and virtues, like her freaks and fancies and womanish weaknesses—take on an individual cast and turn of speech, fall into an appropriate and inalienable melody and rhythm, though changing to suit mood and occasion.

This individualizing accent he picks out and illustrates for each of the heroines of the middle comedies and the later romances. It is a hard claim to make good—and he almost succeeds. Even more interesting, indeed the crowning excellence of the book, is his account of what these heroines have in common which distinguishes them from all other "lovers" as Shakespeare's.

Professor Stoll closes by venturing his own explanation for the peculiar quality of the later women, "so much more idyllic and Arcadian than the earlier, closer to nature and the flowers, more serious and ethereal, more self-forgetful and self-denying, and bathed in the light less of earth than of heaven." He scornfully brushes aside Professor Dover Wilson's belief that Shakespeare had suffered a spiritual and physical breakdown and was recuperating, comforted by his daughter, in the pastoral quiet of Stratford. "Of that what does any of us know, or of Shakespeare's relations to his daughter, or, at the time of writing these plays, even of his place of residence? To me it is all mere conjecture arising out of the preconception that, poetry being the imitation of life, bits of contemporary life can there be identified, or that the objects described, such as flowers and maidens, must be in the immediate neighbourhood." Professor Stoll characteristically offers his explanation not on "the basis of the poet's experience, whereof we

know nothing, but of his art, whereof we should know something." Shakespeare, like other great artists, reverted to the mood and style of his early work, became romantic again, and "it was only natural that, as with them, qualities of the early period should blend with those which had developed since. Moreover it is the tendency of an art, whether of the individual practitioner or of the group, to work out to the limit, though after an interval, a *motif* once found fruitful and acceptable."

It is almost a relief to turn from the critics to a seemingly disinterested historian like Professor Hardin Craig. In *The Enchanted Glass*[6] he has given that picture of the Elizabethan mind which Professor Dover Wilson had called for as a missing essential to a complete understanding of Shakespeare's drama. It would be pointless to try to suggest here the packed richness of the book, which in ten erudite chapters displays the characteristic ideas, beliefs, and mental reactions of the Renaissance man compared with our modern selves. Starting with an account of the age's metaphysics and its cosmology, "a static and intelligible world order, explicable in terms of man's own good" (a concept, one might add, the very questioning of which is the basis of Shakespeare's tragedy), Professor Craig reveals what peculiarly marks Renaissance theology, science, learning, education, and psychology. But he is not merely the student of a by-gone culture. His main concern is with the illumination of the literature, and his book is offered as a contribution to a new scholarly synthesis which he expresses as "the art of making the literature of the past come to life (with its own life)." He is emphatic in his statement of the historian's creed, that the only way to know Shakespeare is to see him with Elizabethan eyes. With those who demand the liberty of interpretation he has no patience. It is, he asserts, "an obvious fact that in literature those matters which are given importance by the emphasis of feeling, thought and literary skill, must be the matters important in the lives and opinions of the authors and, only by accident or by the recurrent patterns of human life and art, the things which are important to us."

The very great value of the work of Professor Craig and his school in clarifying the cultural background of Renaissance literature goes without saying. But even the historians, like the inter-

[6] *The Enchanted Glass: The Elizabethan Mind in Literature*, by Hardin Craig, Oxford University Press, 1936.

preters, tend extravagantly to claim finality for their views. The cult of the complete Elizabethan Shakespeare or nothing, can be carried too far. The loss we suffer from ignorance of the contemporary circumstances conditioning his drama can be overstated. Despite the head-shaking of the scholars, the untutored but averagely sensitive modern mind can fairly adequately make the imaginative adjustment to a world other than its own. Moreover, "the matters important in the lives and opinions of the authors" and "what are important to us" do still largely coincide. As Professor Craig himself says, "Shakespeare's superiority seems in part at least to lie in his truth to life as subsequent ages have determined it."

RENDER UNTO CAESAR*

CHARLES N. COCHRANE

Interest in the career of Augustus Caesar is twofold. As a record of purely personal achievement, it ranks among the most spectacular of success-stories in human history. "Few men," as the author observes, "have entered upon a more apparently hopeless task than Augustus when, in his nineteenth year, he left Apollonia, and few have ever won a more triumphant success." But, with Augustus, the triumph of the man was at the same time the triumph of an idea, in the realization of which the world was to find peace, security, and happiness for at least two centuries. And so completely did the Emperor identify himself with this idea as to merit the apotheosis which, according to notions already acclimatized in Rome by an authority no less respectable than Cicero, is reserved for the rulers and saviours of states; for his spirit was to be enshrined, along with that of the Eternal City itself, in the cult of Augustus and Rome. From this standpoint, his mentality was that of *un être tout à fait politique*, to study which is to raise, in an acute form, the problem of creative politics. To this problem the author makes a notable contribution in his present book.

Considered as an effort of descriptive analysis, the book leaves little to be desired. Certain statements may, indeed, be questioned. It is, for example, doubtful whether the project of moral and

**Augustus*, by John Buchan, Hodder and Stoughton (Musson), 1937.

spiritual reformation is to be attributed to a period as early as that of 36-33 B.C., or whether the right of the Emperor to control the election of magistrates through his powers of nomination and recommendation is in any way connected with his possession of tribunician power. But, in general, it may be agreed that the author has a wide and accurate knowledge of the available source-material; and he brings to his task not merely the resources of a finished literary craftsman, but a sense of historical values such as he had previously demonstrated in his *Cromwell*. The reader may therefore expect a lively and judicious presentation of the evidence and he will not be disappointed; by this standard, the work fulfils every reasonable demand of biography.

At the same time, it invites attention as an attempt to explore, at least in part, "the mind of a great man." On this score, the author leaves no doubt as to where he himself stands. "Augustus gave the Empire a soul, and he laboured also to correct the disharmonies of its body." The Augustan constitution remains "one of the major products of the human intelligence." This is to suggest that the achievement of Augustus was something more than "to have saved the world from disintegration;" it was "to remake and redirect it by a courageous realism and supreme powers of character and mind."

The views thus expressed represent a departure from those popularized by Mommsen, who saw no way of exalting his hero except by disparaging his successor, and whose extravagant eulogy of Julius as "the entire and perfect man" is in sharp contrast with his estimate of Augustus as one who "wore the mask of greatness but was himself not great." Mommsen's opinion reflects a temperamental intolerance of all but Bismarckian methods, but a measure of experience in the actual problems of government might perhaps have taught him to appreciate the importance of other and no less essential qualities of leadership. And it may freely be conceded that the dictator laid the foundations of a new imperial order while still maintaining with our author that, under him, Rome to some extent lost her way in the world. To restore her to the path of destiny, what was needed was the "profound practical intelligence," the patient and sedulous industry of an Augustus.

In this connection it may be suggested that the original position of the younger Caesar was not so much that of an "heir apparent" as of the legatee to what might easily have proved a *damnosa*

hereditas. Nor is there adequate reason to suppose that, at this time, his programme included anything beyond the rehabilitation of Caesar's name and the vindication of his own claims under Caesar's will. Yet this was enough to involve him in a struggle for power which was to be concluded only with Philippi and Actium. Throughout this period, his status was that of a mere faction-leader and he shrank from nothing which would promote his interests, justifying his conduct in terms of *pietas*, a real or assumed loyalty to his father's memory. At the same time, he learned to admire or, at any rate, to exploit certain of the most vital and deep-seated impulses of Graeco-Roman life. What those impulses were may be discovered from the pages of Vergil; to give them effective expression became the task of the Emperor. In this he was powerfully assisted, not merely by his own "congenital conservatism" but by the fact that he outlived by a whole generation the bitter animosities of the Civil Wars. Under his guidance, the moral and social aspirations of antiquity at last came to fruition in the impressive structure of the Augustan peace.

As to the immense benefits of that peace, there can be no serious question. To Romans and Italians, it represented at once the fulfilment of their "manifest destiny" as an imperial people and a justification of the role which they had played in the troubled history of the Mediterranean. In the words of a Caesarian of the revolutionary generation: "Should this empire perish either through disease or from fate, who can doubt that the result will be world-wide devastation, blood-shed and strife?" To the victims of republican predatory imperialism it provided a blessed relief from the exploitation which had made the Rome of Cicero's day "stink in the nostrils of the provincials," as well as the prospect of full participation in the economic and cultural advantages of the universal commonwealth. To all subjects of Caesar alike it offered a vision of social justice on principles to be embodied in the classical jurisprudence; principles which, according to Sohm, "guaranteed the permanent and essential elements of the private personality;" that is to say, it looked forward to the *bourgeois* paradise which was to excite the enthusiastic admiration of Gibbon.

But can history accept the claim to finality which, for these reasons, was put forward on behalf of the new régime? To endorse that claim would be to overlook the *chronique scandaleuse* of the imperial palace, the tragedies of a dynasticism imposed upon

members of his own household by the ambitions of the founder; ambitions which, however natural, were (we may add) hardly consistent with the formal profession of republican principles. It would be to forget the ruthless liquidation of intransigent republicans which, beginning with Tiberius under the provisions of the *Lex Maiestatis*, was to result in the virtual extinction of the ancient aristocracy. It would be to condone restrictions upon human freedom which, though doubtless justifiable in terms of political expediency, nevertheless made it impossible, in the words of Tacitus, "to say what you think and think what you will." Finally, it would be to subscribe to an ideal of justice which identified it with the maintenance of a rigid social structure in which property (including slaves) remained the immovable foundation of human relationships. Such considerations are not, indeed, decisive; but they are enough to show that the Augustan peace was a *pax imperfecta*, an enforced order which, while perhaps requisite for a people capable neither of freedom nor of servitude, yet depends for its *ultima ratio* upon the sword.

To say this is not to condemn Augustus nor the *arcana imperii* of which he proved himself such a skilful exponent. But it is to suggest that he operated within ideological limitations which must be appreciated if the world is ever to arrive at a just appraisal of the debt it owes to Caesar. And the limitations in question are precisely those of "creative" politics. Statecraft constructs; it does not create, since the material with which it deals consists of native moral and spiritual forces which are presupposed in all forms of its activity. These forces it may indeed stimulate and direct, as it may also pervert or destroy them. But, in that case, its function is purely and simply one of social mechanics; to describe it as one of regeneration is to subscribe to one of the most dangerous fallacies of the political mind. And the statesman grossly overestimates himself who, in return for his services, accepts the adoration due to an earthly providence. To recognize these truths is to perceive the need for a more adequate principle of discrimination than is usually employed in discussions of the Caesars. That the author is conscious of such a need is indicated by his repeated references to the "young man of Galilee." As they stand, however, these references are not very helpful, for they contain no hint that, in the kingdom proclaimed by that young man, was to be found *inter alia* the instrument for a drastic revision of the pretensions of Caesar and of the values consecrated in his name.

CLAIRVOYANCE, TELEPATHY, AND PSYCHOLOGY*

S. N. F. CHANT

New Frontiers of the Mind presents the findings of a seven-years' investigation of extra-sensory perception, or clairvoyance, and telepathy, conducted at Duke University. In the experiments reported, a pack of twenty-five cards was used in which five different designs, namely a circle, a square, wavy lines, a cross, and a star, each appeared five times. As a rule the subjects were required to name the design on each card as the experimenter drew and held them face down, or while they remained stacked before him. If the subject's accuracy was reliably greater (in the statistical sense) than the most likely chance result, such an occurrence was accepted as a demonstration of clairvoyance. When the experimenter merely thought of the order of a pack of such cards and the subject checked his guesses against this, the test was one of telepathy.

New Frontiers of the Mind is fairly representative of a large group of publications which may be critically evaluated from various standpoints. In the first place it may be considered solely as a source of entertainment. From this standpoint its value has been amply demonstrated by its wide circulation and its prominence in current newspaper items and radio programmes. In addition it may be thought to have a certain informative value. It can be readily conceded to possess this value with regard to that type of information which provides pleasant conversational material for luncheons, teas, and bridge parties. These two values provide sufficient justification for recommending the book for general reading. Beyond these values, however, Dr. Rhine and numerous readers maintain that the book has scientific importance. This raises quite a different claim.

The scientific value of such a book is not a matter to be decided by the general public. Only persons of scientific training are qualified to pass upon its importance. In so doing, the scientist is concerned with two main questions: the scientific reliability of the information presented, and the scientific significance of such information.

The first of these considerations requires a critical appraisal of the acceptability of the method employed for obtaining the infor-

**New Frontiers of the Mind*, by J. B. Rhine, Oxford University Press, 1937.

mation. This turns upon the adequacy of the control of the experimental situation and the extent to which the results have been confirmed by other observers. Certain criticisms have been made with reference to the translucence of the cards, bias on the part of the experimenters, and the casual nature of the general working conditions. Attempts to confirm the findings have yielded contradictory results; some investigators verifying the findings, others denying them. Broadly speaking, however, Dr. Rhine's results are as scientifically reliable as is a considerable amount of information, of a more conventional sort, which is accepted in scientific psychology. Had his results not been so contradictory to the general standpoint of conventional psychology there would have been little criticism of his experimental method.

The adequacy of the method, however, does not guarantee the significance of the results. Dr. Rhine probably could have reported with an exceedingly high degree of scientific reliability that all his subjects came for the tests wearing shoes, but such a report would not have had much significance. Such a finding would have been too irrelevant to the matter under consideration.

In the investigations reported, Dr. Rhine has presented his findings in a form which so reduces their significance as to make them almost negligible. We must assume that he would not have done this unless forced to by the nature of his findings. Had he been able he would have chosen some better way for bringing out their significance. This does not say much for his findings.

In order to indicate their significance, he has made use of the theory of probability. For this purpose he calculated the most likely number of correct calls which would occur according to chance, and compared his subjects' calls with this prediction. If a subject's correct calls were reliably greater, in the statistical sense, than what would be expected on the basis of chance, he accepted this as being due to extra-sensory perception.

A real question may be raised as to whether or not the use made of the theory of probability in this study is correct. When the theory of probability is employed as a criterion for evaluating empirically obtained results, we expect that the distribution of empirical results will approximate in form that derived from the theory. The theoretical probability distribution is one that is symmetrical about the point on the scale which has the maximum likelihood of occurrence. Hence there will be an equal range of

scale values both above and below this point. Dr. Rhine calculated that the score value having the maximum likelihood according to chance, is five. The correctness of this can hardly be questioned since there were five different designs each occurring five times in a pack of twenty-five cards. But since the lowest possible score is zero correct calls, and the highest possible score is twenty-five, it follows that there is a range of twenty scores above the score of maximum likelihood, and a range of only five scores below it. This will result in anything but the symmetrical form of distribution required for a legitimate application of calculations based upon the theory of probability. The result of this distortion reduces considerably the statistical significance of his findings.

Dr. E. C. Kellogg, of the Department of Psychology in McGill University, further criticizes Dr. Rhine's use of probability by pointing out that the type of setting employed in the investigation does not yield a truly random sampling. In addition, Dr. Rhine tends to ignore negative findings; and when a subject's score starts to fall off, as would be expected according to chance, he dismisses the result as being due to a weakening of the subject's clairvoyant power. Dr. Kellogg further claims that sufficient data have not been provided for any adequate calculation of the chance values to be carried out.

Since the theory of probability is such an exceedingly elusive matter, theoretical criticisms such as the above are always subject to controversy. This cuts both ways; for while it reduces the bite of theoretical criticism, it reduces to a like extent the force of any arguments based upon its use. According to the theory of probability anything may happen; and, in fact, it is invariably the unusual that does happen. Thus in playing bridge there are millions of chances against getting any single bridge hand, and yet getting some kind of a bridge hand is a very ordinary occurrence. To claim that any occurrence does not happen according to chance requires some positive statement of why it does happen, because anything may happen according to chance. In order to meet this requirement Dr. Rhine postulates a power of clairvoyance or telepathy. This is scarcely sufficient to establish its scientific significance. It is too similar to saying that music comes from a radio because there are little men inside the cabinet who sing and play, and when the question is raised as to how we know the men are in there, we are told that they must be there because we can

hear them. As distinct from this, what is required is a positive description of the occurrence and of the conditions which affect it. Dr. Rhine merely touched upon this when he investigated the effect of drugs upon the correctness of the subjects' judgments.

Even if we grant that these investigations have demonstrated the existence of extra-sensory perception and telepathy, the findings still fail to be of any particular significance. The results, obtained as they were from numerous subjects and after seven years of research, show that such powers provide a very uncertain basis for even such an insignificant performance as guessing cards. The guesses of even the best subjects are neither sufficiently correct nor consistent enough to provide an adequate guide for any course of action. Even when we are playing cards, a sound knowledge of the principles of the game (or, if one prefers, dexterity in the manipulation of the cards when shuffling and dealing) would still constitute a much sounder basis for winning than all the extra-sensory perception or telepathy that may have been demonstrated by these investigations. Further, there is no indication that these powers develop with practice. If anything, the opposite appears to be the case with some subjects. This practically eliminates the last claim of the findings to any psychological significance. True, further investigations may conceivably reveal something of significance, but as yet there is no indication that this will be the case.

There will always be those for whom the mysterious and the vague have a special attraction. For such, Dr. Rhine's book is heartily recommended: they will enjoy it. For those who prefer well-founded and significant information, no such recommendation is offered.

GERMAN HELLENISM*

H. Steinhauer

It is a tribute to British scholarship that it realized very early the immense influence which Greek civilization has exercised on modern German life and thought, more especially on German literature of the last two centuries. In 1923 appeared Marshall

**The Tyranny of Greece over Germany*, by E. M. Butler, Cambridge University Press (Macmillans in Canada), 1935.

Montgomery's book on *Friedrich Hölderlin and the German Neo-Hellenic Movement*—a rather pedantic and poorly written work, but important nevertheless in digging out a large store of valuable information. The next year Professor J. G. Robertson delivered and published his Taylorian lecture on *The Gods of Greece in German Poetry*—an extremely able survey of a vast field of research, but necessarily sketchy. Ten years later Mr. Humphrey Trevelyan published a short study, *The Popular Background to Goethe's Hellenism*, in which he retraced in greater detail some of the ground already covered by Montgomery. Robertson's brief paper could not, Montgomery's and Trevelyan's volumes did not, do any sort of justice to this fascinating and vital intellectual current in modern German non-academic thought. It was left for Miss E. M. Butler to give the English-speaking world the first really significant monograph on the subject.

The title of Miss Butler's book—*The Tyranny of Greece over Germany*—indicates clearly her opinion of the Graecomania which has held the greatest German thinkers and writers enslaved for the last two centuries. Why the Germans, more than any other people, have succumbed to this blind adoration of the Greeks is a problem for the social psychologist. Miss Butler offers one suggestive explanation: the traditional incapacity of the German to resist the allurement of abstract ideas and ideals. But her main concern is to study the phenomenon as it revealed itself in the life and thought of individual men, and her fascinating book consists of a series of essays on the high priests of this religious cult, Winckelmann its founder, Lessing and Herder its interpreters, Goethe its great creative spirit, Schiller its antagonist, Hölderlin its martyr, Heine its rebellious subject, and on four recent victims of its powerful spell—Schliemann, a Winckelmann *redivivus*, Nietzsche the Dionysian, Spitteler the mythologist, and Stefan George the mystagogue.

Her book, Miss Butler frankly admits, is no exhaustive treatment of the subject; she has left large tracts of her vast theme unexplored. She has paid scant attention to the problem of sources; she has not raised the question whether the German Hellenists really understood the Greeks before whom they were doing obeisance. She has avoided like the plague the uninspired fact-grubbing methods of Montgomery and Trevelyan; there is not the faintest smell of the lamp about her study. She has steeped herself in the

personalities and works of the men about whom she writes; and she uses the facts of their lives to illuminate their mental world. She analyses their likes and dislikes, their preferences and prejudices, their ideals and their aversions, in so far as these were moulded by the example of Greek civilization.

Miss Butler's book has its weak pages. The section dealing with Goethe is by far the best; it is a model of *critical* appreciation, a welcome relief from the blind adulation which disfigures German criticism of Goethe and which is creeping into non-German writing as well. On the other hand, she pays too much attention to Winckelmann's life and too little to his ideas. She is inclined at times to be over-subtle—and therefore unconvincing—as when she deduces Heine's supposed hostility to Goethe from his writings. She senses a sinister and malicious intention in passages which sound perfectly innocent even when they are re-read in the light of her argument. And though her unsparing arraignment of Stefan George's mystagoguery is fully justified, her reluctance to pay tribute to George the poet is a mistake—the same mistake that Fritz Strich made some years ago.

The essay on Nietzsche is the least adequate in the book. Miss Butler practically admits as much and justifies herself on the ground that the new Dionysian twist which Nietzsche gave to the German Neo-Hellenic religion was really the discovery of Heine, and Nietzsche was merely its first victim. But the evidence which she marshals to prove this theory is unconvincing; and even if Heine did anticipate Nietzsche in viewing Greek civilization as ruled by the spirit of Dionysos rather than that of Apollo, nevertheless it was through Nietzsche's powerful stimulus, not Heine's, that the Dionysian cult has spread over the contemporary world.

This failure to appreciate adequately the role played by Nietzsche in the history of German Hellenism follows naturally from Miss Butler's estimate of Winckelmann's part in the movement. She accepts the traditional view that Winckelmann's "discovery" of the Greeks brought a new wave of Paganism into German literature and thought. As a matter of fact Paganism existed in German literature long before Winckelmann came upon the scene. Professor Julius Petersen has aptly characterized the rhythm of German thought, from the origins to our own day, as a periodical alternation between vernal joy in life and autumnal sadness, between the brightness of day and evening twilight,

between an ideal of happiness in the present moment and a profound absorption in the night side of nature. This repeated seesawing between a sensuous, realistic joy in the finite and a vague, mystical, eternally unsatisfied yearning for infinity shows clearly that German literature has always oscillated between the two poles of Paganism and Christianity. In Winckelmann's day Germany was just emerging from a period of intense Christianity, preparing for a Pagan rebirth. What Winckelmann did was to side-track this renascent wave of Paganism into a special channel. He discovered in the Greeks a concrete historical model for the Pagan view of life and, by equating Paganism with Hellenism, established a new *mythos*—so dear to the German heart—and laid the foundation for a new religion. The relatively simple and clear-cut phenomenon of Paganism was replaced by a complex, contradictory mass of features represented by the organic entity of Greek civilization; for reality is always more complex than the abstract idea. The matter was still further aggravated by the fact that Greek civilization itself shows a development from Paganism to Christianity. Nietzsche realized this very keenly. "Christianity," he wrote, "merely continues the anti-classical, anti-Pagan current which already existed in Greece and Rome." And he condemned the Periclean age for no longer cherishing Pagan ideals. Yet this was the very century to which German Hellenism paid homage under the influence of Winckelmann's example.

Was this diversion of Paganism into Hellenic channels an error on Winckelmann's part? Was he steering the wrong course? Or was he not the "latter-day Greek" Miss Butler supposes him to have been? This, at any rate, is the opinion of Walther Rehm, the foremost investigator in the field of German Hellenism, in a brilliant study *Götterstille und Göttertrauer*, published some years ago. Winckelmann's conception of Hellenism, Rehm finds, is deeply coloured by Stoic, mystical, pietistic—in short, by Christian—elements. It is significant, Rehm further points out, that after Winckelmann it is Lessing the rationalist and Deist who is most influential in interpreting Greek civilization to the Weimar classicists and in giving characteristic shape to the concept of "humanity" which plays so central a role in the thought of Herder, Goethe, and Schiller. And what was that concept of humanity in essence? A belief in salvation through love and human brotherhood, is Strich's definition, a religious ideal which sought to subdue

and destroy the passions, to achieve a harmony of the emotions. What could be more Christian in spirit than this idea, for all its Greek garb?

A surprising indebtedness to the spirit of Christianity is revealed not only by Herder and Schiller—who might be termed Christian by temperament—but even by "the great Pagan" Goethe, as writers from Heine to Thomas Mann have testified. The same is true of Hölderlin, who attempted to identify Dionysos, the god of intoxication, revelry, and sex, with the Galilean. The same is true of Heine and of Gottfried Keller.

It was Nietzsche who checked this whole development begun by Winckelmann's "discovery," and brought the old conflict between Paganism and Christianity back into German thought. His Dionysian philosophy is pure Paganism stripped of all Christian features. But though Nietzsche's Paganism is Germanic as much as Hellenic, it is significant that Nietzsche still pays homage to the Greeks; indeed, he glorifies them far more than Winckelmann or his successors had ever done. Only Nietzsche's Greece is no longer the Periclean age, but the Greece of the pre-Socratics, still free from the "taint" of Plato's Christian ideals. And so the worship of Hellas is used to bolster up a way of life based on the free play of the animal instincts, more specifically the will to power.

Moreover, Nietzsche dragged the religion of Hellenism out of the sheltered close of literature and philosophy into the public arena of politics. The ugly political symptoms in our own day which have materialized as political dictatorships, are to a large measure traceable to the new Paganism of which Nietzsche was the prophet in the name of Greece.

Is it still possible to doubt that Nietzsche deserves a central place in any discussion of German Hellenism?

RECENT STUDIES OF SWIFT: A SURVEY*

HERBERT DAVIS

It is curious that, while Swift's cynical references to the neglect which he anticipated from posterity have never been justified, some of his most ironical jibes have been almost literally fulfilled.

> Where's now this fav'rite of Apollo?
> Departed:—and his works must follow;
> Must undergo the common fate;
> His kind of wit is out of date.

Perhaps at no time in the last two hundred years has that been true. His works have aroused loathing and horror at times, but they have never been entirely neglected. And to-day his youthful impudent challenge to the critics, after belabouring them so mercilessly—"I hope I have deserved so well of their whole body as to meet with generous and tender usage at their hands"—falls harmless to the ground, so ready is their whole body to offer him admiration and homage. Indeed, in looking through the work of Swift's biographers and critics and editors during only the last seven years, we may seem to be reviewing the results of some such preposterous experiment as that which he gaily proposed in *A Tale of a Tub*, namely that "every prince in Christendom will take seven of the deepest scholars in his dominions, and shut them up close for seven years in seven chambers, with a command to write seven ample commentaries on this comprehensive discourse." We shall at any rate be concerned with the work of some of the "deepest scholars" in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Germany, Italy, and America.

After Monsieur Emile Pons[1] had published, in 1925, the first volume of his careful and exhaustive study of Swift, which promised to gather up and sift and test all the available evidence, it might have been expected that no further work of this kind would be deemed necessary for some time. But there soon appeared a book by that professional biographer Mr. Stephen Gwynn,[2] and a striking

*This is the first of a new type of article with which it is proposed to conclude, from time to time, the review section: namely, a survey, by a specialist, of the recent work done in some field of literary, philosophical, or historical study. The notes, placed at the end, combine the functions of title-list and footnote. Professor Davis's survey was read before the Modern Language Association of America.

modern character-study by Mr. Carl van Doren.[3] The first is drawn in the conventional manner: a full-length figure of the Dean, with his *Works* in his hands, and, as a background, glimpses of the main scenes of his life: idyllic—Moor Park, and Stella walking in Sir William Temple's garden; tempestuous—the Court of Queen Anne with the doomed Tory politicians, and at a window the doomed Vanessa; triumphant—greatness in exile overcoming the enemies of Ireland; tragic—dying like a rat in a hole. The second is a beautiful simplification in the manner of much contemporary portraiture. In his own words Mr. van Doren "has preferred to examine the entire evidence, to select what he believes to be the truth, to tell it, and to leave gossip where gossip belongs. . . . His difficulties belong with the secrets of his trade." We are given, that is to say, in clearly defined outline, a study of his subject placed in a certain light, and presented convincingly from a definite point of view. A very distinct personality emerges, a recognizable character, lifted clear out of the confusion of the age and set immediately before us, out of the reach of the shadows cast by intervening time.

How is it then—you may ask—that the result is so different from that more recent study in the modern manner, the work of Mario Rossi and Joseph Hone,[4] entitled *Swift, or The Egotist?* One of the most obvious reasons is that such a method is clearly not suitable for team work. A young Italian, interested in English philosophy, having combined with Mr. Hone to produce a book on Berkeley, suddenly discovers a clue to solve all the enigmas of Swift, which he duly worked out in an essay published in *Life and Letters*. Then he remembers that Mr. Hone has considerable knowledge of early eighteenth-century Ireland, and goes to him again for more facts, for further instances to prove his thesis. They thereupon read Swift's chief writings, the letters and a few standard biographies, and produce a very striking piece of caricature, emphasized in the modern manner by the use of certain symbols, *e.g.*, "a cold pillar, erect and strong, alone in the midst of ruins, and yet sufficient in itself, as if it had never been meant to be part of a building." The fashions have changed, but it is still another variation on Thackeray's theme: "He was always alone—alone and gnashing in the darkness. . . . An immense genius; an awful downfall and ruin; . . . thinking of him is like thinking of an empire falling." The authors boast that it is a biography "recon-

structed from a contemporary point of view . . . with the fixed idea to control and explain the particular evidence," and they suggest in a phrase, which may not always be read as they intended, that "the value of this biography should be as the value of our modern culture."

I need not comment on the lack of knowledge and the many inaccuracies in this book; they are obvious to any instructed reader. But I should like to refer to a particular form of the personal heresy, which seems to me too prevalent in such biographies of men of letters. Let a man beware of wit and irony, let him beware of words flung down in contempt or indignation or pride; detraction will seize upon them and use them as evidence against him, as proof that he is a hypocrite, a scoundrel, or an egoist. Satirical images, impressions of a certain moment or incident, are used as evidence to form this monster of an egoist, standing alone completely detached both from God and man. Signor Rossi, for instance, remarks apropos of a famous passage from the *Tale of a Tub:* "By seeing society as an asylum, one detaches oneself from it far more than does the hermit in the wilderness;" and concerning Swift's writings on religion he gathers this impression, and immediately stamps it as an unchanging attitude: "Before God he wanted to remain as Jonathan Swift. . . . Hard as a diamond, and as a diamond incorruptible, this soul, he felt, could not undergo death." Here is no distinction between literature and life, between history and gossip; and when in addition the literature is carelessly read and the history inaccurately set down, the final result is not very impressive. This is really only a fresh furbishing up of that argument presented a few years before, with more knowledge and therefore more inexcusably, by Mr. Shane Leslie,[5] who picks up the skull of Swift and theatrically pronounces his malediction: "Here is a man who had no soul."

We are left with two other biographical and critical studies,[6] which, if less exciting reading, are reliable. Though not claiming to have made any new discoveries, both attempt a fresh appraisal of Swift's work. Their authors have felt, very rightly, that earlier studies of Swift have been too exclusively concerned with the problems of his life and character, and that there is room for more criticism of his writings, and comment on his art. I cannot help wondering, therefore, why they did not consider the possibility of

adopting for their studies a form less like that of the traditional biography.

Mr. Taylor[7] describes his book modestly as a critical essay. It is not a large book, and half of it is devoted to the retelling of the story of Swift; there remain five or six short chapters to discuss the most important works, and here also it is inevitable that a good many very familiar topics should be taken up and discussed. The most sympathetic reader will, I think, be inclined to feel that Mr. Taylor is forced by the very conditions under which he has chosen to work either to content himself with some interesting suggestions which he has no opportunity to develop fully, or else to select for fuller treatment one or two critical problems about which he feels he has something fresh to say.

Mr. Quintana[8] has been more successful in his study of *The Mind and Art of Jonathan Swift;* the texture of his book is closer, the workmanship more solid. The investigation of the whole field on which it is based is admirably thorough, as shown by his useful bibliography. I do not know of any one book that could be better recommended to students of Swift. It has the virtues of a good handbook, in supplying all the essential information in a reliable way; and in addition it has the distinction of a fresh approach, as indicated in the title. "The purpose of the present study," says Mr. Quintana in the Preface, "is to present what is now known of Swift the writer, and by projecting him against the background of his age to estimate the qualities of his mind and art. While my critical conclusions are not entirely unoriginal, I shall have failed in one of my chief purposes if I have not made unmistakably clear both through text and notes that most that I have to say about Swift is common property among modern scholars and critics." I find Mr. Quintana scrupulous in acknowledging all private claims on this common property, and at the same time there is little of any value in recent investigations that he has not found a place for. This is so useful a thing to do, that I am inclined to ask not whether he could have written this book in any other way, but whether it ever occurred to him to make two books instead of one—to give us first perhaps a handbook to Swift, and then a study of Swift's mind and art.

A study of the mind of Swift should, I presume, be always part of the task of the biographer; but I am not so sure that a study of his art, which is, in the case of a man of letters, the same thing as

criticism—specifically literary—of his writings, can be adequate if dovetailed into a biographical study. It may, of course, be said that Swift at any rate was really a man of action, and that all his books were deeds rather than art-pieces; they were in no sense written with an eye upon the literary critics and the connoisseurs of art. True; but they are—at least some of them—also literature. And therefore they belong not only to the pattern of his life and to the pattern of the political and social life of his time, but also to the pattern of the thought and the art of the time. For instance, I would maintain that *A Tale of a Tub*, considered apart altogether from its author and the reputation, good and bad, that it brought him, is a most important book as a sort of finale, a superbly exuberant and reckless finale, triumphantly summing up all the heroics and extravagances of seventeenth-century thought and art. Both Mr. Taylor and Mr. Quintana discuss the *Tale* in its relation to seventeenth-century literature, though I think there is a good deal more to be said, for instance, about the delicate parody of, or subtle counterpoint to, some of Thomas Vaughan's romantic rhapsodies. And in examining the form of the work, its elaborate introductions and carefully arranged dislocations, do we not first feel its full significance when we recognize it as a caricature of the most prominent features of a century of baroque art?

Similarly in an examination of the form of *Gulliver's Travels*—the shape of the book as a whole, as distinct from the satirical details—though Swift clearly had in mind many features of the imaginary voyages, the most obvious and at the same time the most illuminating connection seems to me to be that, so well established in Mr. Bonner's recent book on Captain William Dampier,[9] with the actual voyages, which were so popular from 1697 until the time of *Robinson Crusoe* and *Gulliver*. It is not a matter of the influence of Dampier's style upon Swift; it is not a question of investigating another source. It is the adoption for his purpose of a particular form which happened to be in vogue. This is Swift's regular practice, something which varies between parody and imitation, and provides him with the roles of Bickerstaff, Drapier, and Gulliver, Dampier's cousin. And this connection is most important not as supplying merely the framework of the four voyages, but as lending him for his satirical purpose the very speech of this plain, serious, and honest seaman with eager curiosity and notable gift of veracity.

It is not possible to elaborate this further here; but the question may be asked, whether the biographical tradition which has been so central and so persistent in English studies has not certain very definite limitations which we should do well to recognize, especially in its tendency to distract our attention from the real object of literary criticism—the book itself? I am not concerned now with its larger historical significance as part of what Mr. T. S. Eliot calls "the whole movement of several centuries towards the aggrandizement and exploitation of personality." I am concerned with it only as a practical problem for those who are occupied with English studies. It is quite simply a matter of where we should begin. Every book is obviously made in three stages: it is rooted in a man's life, perhaps in some single experience or some particular arrangement of circumstances; later it takes shape as something written down and becomes literature; it completes its function when it is being read. Is it the prerogative of the scholar, unlike the common reader, to begin first with the earlier stages, with the biographical and historical and technical study, and only then afterwards to go on to the reading of the book, to what we may perhaps call the literary and philological study of it? Could we not rather more frequently begin there, and make use of the other studies only as aids to full understanding and interpretation?

It is interesting to look at the recent work of some European scholars, to see whether they, belonging to a different tradition, can give us what we are asking for.

I will take some German studies which at least confine themselves to certain aspects of Swift's work. Hans Gläser,[10] in a dissertation published in 1932, takes for his subject *Swifts Kritik an der englischen Irland-politik*. The material examined is a small part of Swift's work—the pamphlets concerning Irish affairs. Some of the problems of Germany to-day lend a peculiar significance to Swift's views on the relations of the individual to church and state, and this adds an occasional liveliness to Herr Gläser's comments. But he is at a disadvantage in not possessing a sufficiently detailed and intimate knowledge of Irish affairs in the eighteenth century; and sometimes our confidence is shaken when we find him apparently unaware of Swift's dramatic devices. Gulliver, for example, is quoted as expressing Swift's sincere convictions when he boasts to his master "of our own excellent constitution, deservedly the wonder and envy of the whole world." Hans Reimer[11] limits

himself to Swift's *Gedanken und Schriften über Religion und Kirche*, and is therefore able to give a much fuller commentary on this section of Swift's work than it usually receives. But he is concerned with the writings mainly as material out of which to fashion his study of Swift as moralist and sceptic, and to show his connection with the utilitarian motive in English ethics at this time. Two dissertations have been devoted specifically to the study of *Gulliver's Travels*, the first[12] concerned with the mingling of utopian and satirical elements in the book, and insisting on the importance of the former, not indeed always sufficiently recognized, and emphasizing, in a manner perhaps hardly necessary, that Swift's continued interest in the world and its affairs proves him to be no misanthrope. A maturer study, though written in a style which has learned nothing from Swift, is Lilli Handro's[13] interpretation of *Gulliver's Travels* in relation to the ideas of the time. It has the virtue of keeping close to the text, and providing a useful commentary.

The most important contribution that has come from Europe in the last five years is, I believe, Max Arnim Korn's[14] *Die Weltanschauung Jonathan Swifts*, 1935. It is the product of full knowledge both of Swift and of the thought of the time, a careful and scholarly study admirably documented and well written. It is not directly concerned with biographical, psychological, or purely literary problems; but it is based upon a definite conception of Swift's character and temperament, influenced a little by that cautious psychopathic study of Dr. Heidenhain,[15] which appeared in 1934—a book, I might add, which may well be recommended to counteract the violent disgust against all psychological investigations which Cornelius van Doorn's[16] intolerable puerilities are bound to produce. The book is also a convincing reply to the arguments advanced in a superficial essay by Herbert Read, which had the prominence of a leading article in the *T.L.S.* (Nov. 28, 1926), and was reprinted in a volume entitled *The Sense of Glory*, 1929. Herr Korn contends that a fair reading of Swift's works and a full investigation of his activities as a politician and a churchman reveal a man of definite and clear principles; and he states these principles with great clarity and fine distinction. He, too, is touched by the spirit of the time which enables him without difficulty to idealize Swift's dictatorial capacities, and his readiness to ride over the individual in his passion for order and conformity. His main interest is in Swift's theory

and practice as a churchman and politician rather than as a man of letters.

In the periodicals of recent years there is evidence of the same continued interest in Swift, which shows itself in more detailed investigations of the authenticity and bibliography of particular works, and of the literary background and sources. I shall not try to enumerate all these articles but to indicate the kind of emphasis they give, so that we may look over the field and consider whether any parts of it might be more profitably cultivated.

Of first importance are the records of fresh discoveries. However small, they often serve to bring out other information not perhaps generally known. I wish particularly to refer to the discovery in 1930 of the MS. of a letter from Stella to Captain Dingley, dated Dublin, May 21, 1723, as Mr. Shane Leslie's account[17] in his lecture on the script of Jonathan Swift is unfortunately vague in not mentioning that it was Mr. J. A. Rice[18] who had the curiosity to search through the records of the Temple family preserved at Broadlands, Hampshire, and was rewarded by finding the manuscript there. Mr. Shane Leslie might also have made use, in the same lecture, of Mr. Sidney Gulick's[19] paper establishing the authenticity of Swift's poem *The Day of Judgement*. Stella's letter is not an exciting one though it gives her an opportunity for two of the misspellings Swift used to chide her for—*bussiness*, and a lovely word used twice, *exstreamly*—but the importance of it is that it provides an indisputable specimen of her handwriting, which proves Mr. Williams[20] to have been right in his guess that the MS. of a word-book containing simple explanations of over nineteen hundred words of Latin derivation was in her hand, as also the valuable MS. volume of poems given by Swift to Sir Arthur Acheson, and now in the library of the Duke of Bedford. A few months later, Mr. Shane Leslie[21] reported the discovery of the beautiful MS. in Swift's hand of the Temple Memoirs (referred to in the Sale Catalogue) belonging to the Shirley collection.

Mr. Williams also called attention for the first time (in a paper[22] read before the Bibliographical Society) to a folio fair copy in the Royal Library, Windsor, of *The History of the Last Four Years of the Queen*, "carefully written by an amanuensis, and not less carefully corrected and revised by Swift himself." On the first page Swift has noted: "Written at Windsor in the Year 1713." This settles all doubts as to the authenticity of the edition of 1758,

and shows that both the London and Dublin editions were printed from a copy including the author's final corrections, although there are other minor differences in the texts.

Of rarities which have recently come into the market, I will mention only two of considerable interest from Robinson's recent catalogue, no. 59: a hitherto unknown collection of the original numbers of Partridge's *Infallible Astrologer* for 1700-1701, and an unrecorded first printing of *Gulliver's Travels* in serial form in the *Penny London Post* for Nov. 25-Dec. 30, 1726, beginning less than a month after the original appearance of the first edition, and anticipating the serial publication in *Parker's Penny Post.* It is amusing to note that the serial publication of *Don Quixote* was interrupted because of the great demand for *Gulliver.*

Assisted by Miss Nora M. Mohler, Miss Marjorie Nicolson has undertaken the most fruitful of recent investigations into Swift's sources in her work on the scientific background of Gulliver's third voyage. Two parts of this most important study have already appeared,[23] adding not merely to our knowledge of the sources of *Gulliver's Travels* but providing a fuller and juster understanding of the *Voyage to Laputa*, which has always been considered less successful than the rest of the book. Miss Nicolson has been fortunate in coming fresh to Swift from a close study of the works of contemporary scientists. Swift's parody of the *Voyages* is, then, seen to glance not merely at a popular fashion but also at the pseudo-scientific interest shown in the travellers' reports which occupy so much space in the *Transactions of the Royal Society.* It is more surprising, however, to find quite definitely in these *Transactions*, and in other published works of the virtuosi, "the specific source of Swift's Laputans, his projectors of the Grand Academy of Lagado, and his Flying Island." Miss Nicolson is able, in detail, to show us the precise point of Swift's attack. For instance, in describing the vogue for music in Laputa, Swift is concerned not—as often suggested—to make fun of a current taste for opera and new fashions in music, but to rally the scientists, who can only conceive of music in mathematical formulae. Their fear of the sun, and of comets, has particular reference to the much-debated theories of the cooling of the sun, or of disturbances (like the Deluge, as Halley suggested in a paper, revised and published in 1724) likely to be caused by comets. All but two of the experiments going on in the Grand Academy have been definitely proved to be parodies

of actual experiments undertaken by members of the Royal Society, or reported to them. Swift either combines them fantastically or adds a touch of exaggeration which turns them into nonsense. In the second paper all the details of the size and shape and movements of the "Flying Island" are skilfully shown to be adapted from contemporary theories of magnetism, especially those derived from the work of Gilbert, and from various inventions for "flying chariots." Miss Nicolson has elucidated so much that naturally she is inclined to look for the answer to all the riddles of Book III by the same method. But the episode of Gulliver's visit to Lord Munodi and the political parable of the insurrection of the Lindalinians probably require a second clue, which is to be looked for in the detailed history of the recent events in Ireland; and here, of course, Swift took care wisely to wrap himself in deeper mystery.

Mr. Eddy continues his valuable investigations of Swift's sources, and has recently given us a full account of the attack of the wits on John Partridge,[24] which justifies Swift against Sir Leslie Stephen's complaint that he showed poor taste in hounding a poor old man of sixty-four out of a living. Others have joined in the hunt for sources: Mr. Frantz,[25] Mr. McClue,[26] and Mr. Webster.[27] The last-named has collected a great deal of information about satires of Puritan enthusiasm before the *Tale of a Tub*, which is thus seen in better perspective. Mr. Babcock[28] has defended Swift against the violent diatribes of the Whig historians and has shown the consistency of his political attitude throughout and his unbroken loyalty to the Anglican Establishment. Mr. Nichol Smith[29] also, in his recent Observations offered to the Royal Society of Literature, has exposed some of the absurdities of the Romantic conception of Swift as a very Jack, tearing off in the violence of his rage all humanity's poor finery and scoffing at man's learning and religion.

Two admirable papers have recently come from Monsieur Emile Pons, who is nearing the completion of the second volume of his biographical and critical study, covering the period of Swift's life from 1699 to 1714. The first[30] offers specific evidences of Swift's debt to Rabelais, in whom may be found the method which Swift employed in making up the words and expressions which he gives as examples of the language of the Lilliputians. The second,[31] a superb example of delicacy and subtlety of perception in the minute analysis of a literary work, provides us with something

really new about the *Journal to Stella*. By comparing the manuscript of the Journal with the manuscript of other letters, Monsieur Pons is able to convince us that the various obliterations of the text in the manuscript are not the work of later editors, but are in the hand of Swift himself, and date, moreover, from the original writing of the letter, in fact, form a sort of intimate way of writing which bears some relation to the "little language" of the *Journal*. Having established this, Monsieur Pons proceeds to an interpretation of the passages so blotted or encircled or struck through, and ventures to suggest how this pen-play would be understood by Stella. It is a fascinating game, a riddle we may well believe Swift to have delighted in; though we may not always feel sure that Monsieur Pons has got the right solution, and may hesitate before accepting his final bold and exciting conjecture.

There are two recent studies which I should like to pick out from a number of books and articles dealing with the thought of the seventeenth century, because they seem to me to afford us very definite aid to a better understanding of the satire of Swift where it is levelled against the absurdities of the world of learning. They are concerned with the thought of the same period, though Mr. Bredvold's topic[32] is the intellectual *milieu* of Dryden, and Mr. Jones[33] is specifically investigating the background of *The Battle of the Books*. I would recommend a reading of *The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden*, with Swift definitely in mind. At first sight, as we look at the movement of ideas from 1600 onwards traced in these studies, we may be surprised at an unawareness, or wilful blindness, in Swift. He appears to be too much preoccupied with certain obvious extravagances to realize the direction and force of a movement which was to give shape to the modern world. But as we read further we recognize the prevalence of an attitude which at the time must have attracted many moderate and sensible people. Of such Swift was probably a fair representative in welcoming only such knowledge as seemed to promise practical benefits, such discoveries and experiments as could be applied to life. Neither art for art's sake, nor science nor philosophy for the sake of mere knowledge and the pride of it—but all art, science, philosophy and, we may add, religion were judged by him according to strictly utilitarian values, suitable for a Drapier or a Gulliver. Mr. Jones's account of the controversy between the Ancients and the Moderns in the seventeenth century

in England is a direct contribution to the study of literature; it began very soundly, I think, in the attempt to deal with the problems of a particular book, and then developed into an extensive piece of research in the history of ideas, which in its final form provides us with the first part of an introductory study, essential to a proper reading of all Swift's satire on man's intellectual activity.

But of all the recent contributions to the study of Swift there can be no doubt that the most important is the work of the editors and bibliographers. Mr. John Hayward must have found great satisfaction in preparing the one-volume *Selections from Swift*,[34] printed by the Nonesuch Press. There is little in it which any student of Swift would not wish to find, even if there was not room in less than nine hundred pages to include many things that each of us would like to have added; it is hardly satisfactory, indeed, to have only selections from *A Tale of a Tub*, chosen in such a way as almost to encourage the exploded theory that it may not have been entirely Swift's work. The editing throughout is excellent: it is always clear exactly what text one is reading, and there is a concise but adequate textual apparatus, which provides details of all important changes and corrections introduced in later revisions. It may be doubted whether, in a book intended for a large public, it is advisable to preserve the spelling and conventions of the eighteenth-century printer. In some cases, of course, it adds life to the page, but I doubt whether on the whole it brings us nearer to the author's meaning. I was glad to find a modernized text in the reprint of *Gulliver's Travels* and *A Tale of a Tub*, edited with an excellent introduction by W. A. Eddy for the Oxford Standard Authors.[35] But would it not have been better to take the text of the former from Faulkner's edition, 1735, which is now generally recognized as giving the final revision of Swift himself? In his other volume,[36] which provides a selection from Swift's other writings, Mr. Eddy has compromised by reverting to the spelling and capitalization of the texts he used, without, however, reproducing what was often in the more controversial pamphlets a very effective use of italics and large type—devices which cannot be regarded as printers' conventions, but were often introduced by Swift himself. I confess also that I do not much like the practice of printing from a photostat of the earliest editions, and then altering the text to incorporate revisions and corrections, unless

sufficient textual notes are provided to make it clear what the editor has done.

Mr. Teerink has just completed his bibliography,[37] which has been beautifully printed at the Hague. It is the product of many years' labour, and is an attempt to list all the printed works of the Swift canon, with European translations and works attributed to Swift. Particular attention is given to an analysis of the miscellanies and the collected editions. It is unfortunate that Mr. Teerink's methods of description and reference are not always those most generally adopted; and the section devoted to recent criticism is quite incomplete, and might perhaps have been better omitted in view of the adequacy of the current bibliographies. Indeed, the most important tasks for the bibliographer of Swift still remain to be done, namely, to describe all the known manuscripts, both autographs and copies, and—an extremely difficult task—to fix more definitely the Swift canon, sifting more rigorously the genuine writings from those included by later editors on very slender authority.[38]

The most valuable recent addition to our knowledge of Swift and to the canon of his writings was due to the discovery of the papers of Charles Ford which had been left to his executor, Sir John Hynde Cotton. With the permission of the present owners, these letters of Swift to Ford have been edited by Mr. Nichol Smith.[39] Only one of the fifty-one letters, which happened to have been secured for the British Museum Library in 1896, had been included in Elrington Ball's edition of the *Correspondence*. Ford's papers also contained six of Swift's poems in MS.—two in Swift's handwriting, and four his own copies. In his Introduction Mr. Nichol Smith has discussed the importance of these letters; I need only add how valuable they were to me in tracing the history of the publication of *The Drapier's Letters*.[40] Even more important is the new and conclusive evidence which they supply about the composition of *Gulliver's Travels*. And for the biographer they provide a fresh and intimate glimpse of Swift which it would be dangerous to neglect. "Their distinction is," as the editor says finely, "that, better than any series of letters to any other friend, they give us Swift in undress. We know him better for seeing him in undress. From beginning to end there is not one word which even the most squeamish editor would wish to omit." All who are concerned with the study of Swift will agree that this is by far the

most exciting discovery that has been made for a long time, and will be glad that it fell into the hands of so distinguished a scholar and so experienced an editor.

It is hardly less exciting to take in one's hands for the first time a complete and thoroughly reliable text of Swift's *Poems*, edited with scrupulous care by Mr. Harold Williams, and printed in three handsome volumes by the Clarendon Press.[41] Perhaps no more important task remained to be done for Swift. His contemporaries read his verse partly in miscellanies, where they were left to distinguish as well as they could between his work and that of his friends. Later eighteenth-century collections were equally muddled, and nineteenth-century editors from Sir Walter Scott to Mr. Elrington Ball[42] were inclined to print as Swift's many pieces that other people had left at his door. Swift himself never overvalued his own work or took care to lay claim to his rights; but he did sometimes protest against being held responsible for other people's productions. Now for the first time we can read the poems Swift wrote, rigorously separated from spurious and doubtful material; and we are given for each poem a complete account of its pedigree, traced back to its earliest manuscript or printed original.

This would have been an almost impossible task for anyone who had not had Mr. Williams's long experience both as a collector and as an editor. Even though there may still be difference of opinion as to the date and composition of some of the poems, and a few scraps of manuscript or printed material may still be brought to light, we may be confident that nothing now known in public collections or in private hands has been overlooked. It is not possible here to illustrate the extraordinary thoroughness of Mr. Williams's researches, by reference to his findings in establishing the authentic text of particular poems; but two or three points may be chosen to indicate the value of his edition as a whole. In establishing the canon, he has been able to rely for positive evidence on manuscripts in Swift's hand from the Portland, Orrery, and Fountaine papers, and a volume, in the Duke of Bedford's library, of copies in the handwriting of Stella; and on printed collections, undeniably printed with Swift's approval or with manuscript corrections in his hand, such as the *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse*, 1727, and the second volume of the *Works*, printed by Faulkner in Dublin, 1735. And at least equally valuable is his examination of the large body of verse attributed to Swift, some of

which he has been able definitely to exclude, by exposing the flimsiness of the evidence put forward in its favour.

There is no longer any excuse for neglecting Swift's verse, or despising it, as it has generally been neglected or despised in any consideration of eighteenth-century poetry. And whatever may be thought of its value as poetry, it cannot be denied that Mr. Williams is fully justified in his claim that no biographer of Swift can afford to overlook it, and that even the scraps and trifles and occasional pieces must be carefully studied for the light that they may throw not only upon his character and his motives, but also upon his peculiar quality as a writer and as a humourist.

NOTES

[1]Emile Pons, *Swift, Les années de jeunesse et le "Conte du Tonneau"*, Strasbourg, 1925.

[2]Stephen Gwynn, *The Life and Friendships of Dean Swift*, London, 1933.

[3]Carl van Doren, *Swift*, London, 1931.

[4]M. M. Rossi and J. M. Hone, *Swift, or The Egotist*, London, 1934.

[5]J. R. Shane Leslie, *The Skull of Swift*, London, 1928.

[6]We omit, as contributing nothing new to the subject, a third biography: Bertram Newman, *Jonathan Swift*, London, 1937.

[7]W. D. Taylor, *Jonathan Swift: A Critical Essay*, London, 1933.

[8]Ricardo Quintana, *The Mind and Art of Jonathan Swift*, New York, 1936.

[9]W. H. Bonner, *Captain William Dampier, Buccaneer-author . . .*, Stanford University, [1934].

[10]Hans Gläser, *Jonathan Swifts Kritik an der englischen Irland-politik*, (Inaug. Diss. Breslau), Ohlau, 1932.

[11]Hans Reimer, *Jonathan Swift, Gedanken und Schriften über Religion und Kirche*, (Britannica 9), Hamburg, 1935.

[12]Charlotte Dege, *Utopie und Satire in Swifts Gulliver's Travels*, Frankfort (Oder), 1934.

[13]Lilli Handro, *Swift: Gulliver's Travels*, (Britannica 12), Hamburg, 1936.

[14]Max Arnim Korn, *Die Weltanschauung Jonathan Swifts*, Jena, 1935.

[15]Adolf Heidenhain, *Über den Menschenhass: Eine pathographische Untersuchung über Jonathan Swift*, Stuttgart, 1934.

[16]C. van Doorn, *An Investigation into the Character of Jonathan Swift*, (Amsterdam Diss.), Amsterdam, 1931.

[17]J. R. Shane Leslie, *The Script of Swift and Other Essays*, Philadelphia, 1935.

[18]J. A. Rice, "A Letter for Stella" (in *T.L.S.*, May 29, 1930, p. 457).

[19]S. L. Gulick, "Jonathan Swift's 'The Day of Judgement' " (in *P.M.L.A.*, XLVIII, 1933, pp. 850-5).

[20]Harold Williams, "Stella's Handwriting" (in *T.L.S.*, June 5, 1930, p. 478), and see *Poems*, ed. H. Williams, I, pp. l-li.

[21]Shane Leslie, "Swift's Handwriting" (in *T.L.S.*, July 24, 1930, p. 611).

[22]Harold Williams, "Jonathan Swift and 'The Four Last Years of the Queen'" (in *Library*, XVI, 1935, pp. 61-90).

[23]Marjorie Nicolson and Nora M. Mohler, "The Scientific Background of Swift's Voyage to Laputa" (in *Annals of Science*, II, pp. 299-334, 405-30).

[24]W. A. Eddy, "The Wits *vs* John Partridge, Astrologer" (in *Stud. Philol.*, XXIX, 1932, pp. 29-40).

[25]R. W. Frantz, "Swift's Yahoos and the Voyagers" (in *Mod. Philol.*, XXIX, 1932, pp. 49-57).

[26]G. S. McCue, "A Seventeenth Century Gulliver" (in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, L, 1935 pp. 32-4).

[27]C. M. Webster, "Swift's 'Tale of a Tub' compared with Earlier Satires of the Puritans" (in *P.M.L.A.*, XLVII, 1932, pp. 171-8). Also "Swift and Some Earlier Satirists of Puritan Enthusiasm" (in *P.M.L.A.*, XLVIII, 1933, pp. 1141-53). Also "The Satiric Background of the Attack on the Puritans in Swift's 'A Tale of a Tub'" (in *P.M.L.A.*, L, 1935, pp. 210-23).

[28]R. W. Babcock, "Swift's Conversion to the Tory Party" (in University of Michigan *Studies in Language and Literature*, VIII, 1932, pp. 133-49).

[29]D. Nichol Smith, "Jonathan Swift: Some Observations" (in Royal Society of Literature, *Essays by Divers Hands*, XIV, 1935, pp. 29-40).

[30]Emile Pons, "Rabelais et Swift à propos du Lilliputien" (in *Mélanges offerts à M. Abel Lefranc*, Paris, 1936, pp. 219-28).

[31]Emile Pons, "Du nouveau sur le 'Journal à Stella'" (in *Etudes anglaises*, III, 1937, pp. 1-20).

[32]Louis Bredvold, *The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden*, Ann Arbor, 1934.

[33]R. F. Jones, *Ancients and Moderns, the Background of the Battle of the Books*, (Washington Univ. Studies, new series, 6), St. Louis, 1936.

[34]John Hayward (ed.), *Selections from Swift*, London, 1934.

[35]W. A. Eddy (ed.), *Gulliver's Travels etc.*, New York, 1933.

[36]W. A. Eddy (ed.), *Satires and Personal Writings*, New York, 1932.

[37]Herman Teerink, *A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Jonathan Swift*, The Hague, 1937.

[38]In "Three Unnoticed Writings of Swift" (in *P.M.L.A.*, LI, 1936, pp. 793-802), Mr. van Lennep has brought to light some trifles which editors, including Sir Walter Scott, have missed, and which were first printed in the *Monthly Mirror* in 1797, 1807, and 1808, from (it was vaguely claimed) Swift MS. They can be judged on internal evidence alone: the letter to Mrs. Pendarves fits well enough into the correspondence, and the "Directions to Players" bears a natural resemblance to the "Direction to Servants," but the third (suspected by the editor of the *Monthly Review*) is rightly dismissed by Mr. van Lennep as "very suspicious."

[39]D. Nichol Smith (ed.), *The Letters of Swift to Ford*, Oxford, 1935.

[40]Herbert Davis (ed.), *The Drapier's Letters*, Oxford, 1935.

[41]Harold Williams (ed.), *The Poems of Jonathan Swift*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1937.

[42]Elrington Ball, *Swift's Verse: An Essay*, London, 1929.